DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 020 IR 050 628

AUTHOR Perreault, J. M.; Berman, Sanford
TITLE A Dialogue on the Subject Catalogue. J. M. Perreault: "A Representative of the New Left in American Subject Cataloguing." A Review Essay on Sanford Berman's "The Joy of Cataloging" with Response by Sanford Berman. Occasional Paper Number 161.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Graduate School of Library and Information Science.
PUB DATE Nov 83
NOTE 66p.
AVAILABLE FROM University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 505 E. Armory Street, 249 Armory Bldg., Champaign, IL 61820. ($3.00 per copy).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Cataloging; *Classification; *Library Technical Processes; *Subject Index Terms
IDENTIFIERS *Berman (Sanford); Dewey Decimal Classification; Library of Congress Subject Headings

ABSTRACT

Perreault's essay presents a critical review of "The Joy of Cataloging," a collection of 44 essays, addresses, reviews, and letters by Sanford Berman, head cataloger at the Hennepin County Library (HCL) in Edina, Minnesota. Cataloging principles ascribed to Berman include naturalness and fullness of language, file integration, findability (exemplified by a rich multiplicity of added entries), and fairness (nonoffensive, noncritical cataloging). It is asserted that Berman lacks familiarity with general scholarly practice and with the theoretical foundations of cataloging. Berman's attitudes on descriptive cataloging and his attack on Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2) are described, as are his proposals for avoiding subject headings offensive to groups of persons. A case study in Berman's use of nonoffensive cataloging is given, with comments on Berman's lack of concern for systematicity. Also described are Berman's attitude toward the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) as a system, his views on syndesis and the improvement of subject heading systems, and his opinions on the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) system. The style of Berman's book is also reviewed. A series of heated responses by Sanford Berman and J. M. Perreault, a brief editorial comment, and the authors' vitae conclude the publication. (ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

University of Illinois
Graduate School of Library and Information Science

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ISSN 0276 1769

Number 161
November 1983

ED241020

A Dialogue on the Subject Catalogue

J.M. Perreault: "A Representative of the New Left in American Subject Cataloguing"

A Review Essay on Sanford Berman's *The Joy of Cataloging*

With Response by Sanford Berman

IR050628

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Earl Plested

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Contents

J.M. Perreault: Review Essay, "A Representative of the New Left in American Subject Cataloguing" 3
Introduction 3
1 The Book and Berman's Attitude 3
2 Principles (as He Sees Them, and as I Do) 5
3 Lack of Familiarity with General "Scholarly" Practice and with Theoretical Foundations 8
4 Berman's Attitudes on Descriptive Cataloguing and His Attack on AACR2 9
5 Critical Classification—The Problem of Offensive Headings 11
6 A Case Study in Offensive/Critical Subject Cataloguing 14
7 Offensiveness—Conclusion 17
8 The System of Subject Headings 19
9 Berman on Syndesis 20
10 What Would Berman Do about Subject Headings? 22
11 Berman on the Dewey Decimal Classification 24
12 The Style of the Book 26
13 Epilogue 27
References 28

Sanford Berman Response 30
J.M. Perreault Response 45
Sanford Berman Response II 54
J.M. Perreault Response II 57
Sanford Berman Response III 59
J.M. Perreault Response III 61
Editor's Comment 62
Vitae 63

J. M. PERREAULT: REVIEW ESSAY, "A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NEW LEFT IN AMERICAN SUBJECT CATALOGUING"

Introduction

Cataloguers in the libraries of English-speaking North America are in turmoil these days: first, ISBD(M) and now the whole new code, for author/title headings as well as for description; second, the challenge of PRECIS to replace Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH); third, the arisal of so many competitors to OCLC; fourth, the widespread opposition to the sophistications and relocations in recent editions of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC); fifth, the continuing debate over the most effective form of the catalogue and over the trade-off between effectiveness and cost; and sixth the incursion of extended computerized circulation systems into the domain of the catalogue, especially of the union catalogue. Not all of these impinge upon every cataloguer, but most cataloguers are affected by several and upset by some.

While an answer to many felt problems of American librarianship has been activism within ALA, such institutional activism seems to have little or no effect on such a set of technical problems as this, in contrast to their payoff in more "social" aspects of the profession.

But what *is* possible as a sort of analogue of activism is an underground or guerrilla warfare against some of the dragons of American (I take the word in a fairly broad denotation) librarianship: against the insensitivity of institutions like LC, OCLC, the Forest Press, and ALA as such; against the prejudices and thoughtlessnesses of so many practicing librarians; and against the vapidity of so much that is taught in the library schools. And, we may well ask, what sort of person is more likely to undertake this sort of underground warfare in the province of cataloguing than one who is profoundly sympathetic to the social problem activism that has succeeded in changing so much of American life (including librarianship)? Such a person is Sanford Berman, whose book collects in one volume a representative sampling of his opinions, suggestions and innovations from the years 1969 through 1981.

1* The Book and Berman's Attitude

Of the 44 essays, addresses, reviews, and letters here collected (several not a full page in length), only six (along with the various secton introductions)

*Editor's Note: All boldface section numbers are included to assist the reader in following the subsequent discussions between Messrs. Berman and Perreault. All parenthetical page numbers refer to Sanford Berman's *The Joy of Cataloging*. Phoenix, Ariz: Oryx, 1981.

were never published before. However, since the nine that had previously appeared in *Library Journal* are the only ones available to a large segment of their potential audience (22 were published in the *Cataloging Bulletin* of the author's institution, the Hennepin County Library (HCL) of Edina, Minnesota, and the remaining seven in a variety of journals and books with relatively sparse distribution), most of this material will be new to most of its potential readers.

1.1 In the United States and Canada, however, the ideas of Mr. Berman are not at all unfamiliar to those interested in cataloguing. He has published several books and has attended many national and regional meetings (at which he usually shares his views as freely as one would expect from a crusader such as he) in the course of the 1970s, and is widely regarded as a librarian of courage, vision, articulateness, and concern. It is also true that his courage is seen by many as temerity, his vision as wish-fulfillment, his articulateness as glibness, his concern as busybodiness. For me the truth lies somewhere between, and I see the present collection of ephemerata as data from which that point can be demonstrated, as well as providing a fascinating glimpse into the attitudes of the "service-oriented" revisionists of American subject-cataloguing—one might say the "new left" of that province of librarianship.

1.2 The best thing about Berman's way of being a librarian is that he sees needs for change and improvement in making accessible the contents of libraries and he acts to meet those needs; he doesn't merely talk about them. The sources of turmoil mentioned at the outset have in many cases come upon most American cataloguers like an avalanche—something for which they were not adequately prepared. This leads to a widespread anomie—an attitude that things are not going at all well but that there's nothing anyone can do about it. All this is well expressed in Berman's complaint that there is to be felt "an alarming passivity, even nihilism, among cataloguers and reference librarians alike."(p. xi) And he does not see the way out as being available automatically or from on high; he energetically disbelieves "that the machine, the computer, will itself bring Bibliographic Salvation"(p. xi) because he sees such standardization (both explicit and implicit) as being in the service not of innovation for the sake of meeting real needs, but rather in the service of "the Library of Congress and its lockstep followers."(p. 113) To be such a follower is, for him, to "think that every LC-card, MARC record, or CIP-entry is like a tablet inscribed on Mt. Sinai," and is thus "to let a helluva lot of material go down the drain by killing or reducing access to it through the catalog."(p. 92) Librarianship is not just the providing of materials (selection and ordering), nor even just knowing them "in person" (reader service). Without access to the library's

contents through the catalogue, librarianship is a mere illusion,(cf. p. 105) and if the means of access are not purchaseable it's up to the local librarian out in the trenches to make happen what needs to happen: "If *Dewey, Sears*, LC or card vendors won't [provide good access] the way they should, individual librarians may have to do it themselves."(p. 112) Berman even alludes, it is heartening to note, to Ranganathan's "every reader his/her book."(p. 94)

2 Principles (as He Sees Them, and as I Do)

The principles upon which he would base both the macro- and the micro-structure of the catalogue are naturalness, fullness and integration. These are the principles that I ascribe to him from analysis of his text; he states the matter quite differently(cf. the next paragraph). If at times I disagree with the actual results of the application of these principles, it is likely to be either because these results, while usually good in themselves, often seem to me to obscure desiderata that are even more important; or (more often yet) because, while Berman's opinion may be correct, he provides no foundation upon which I can base a more than emotional or political agreement with him, so that I am left free to conjure up a situation in which what he says is not acceptable. Take for instance the (apparently legitimate) argument that, instead of **American Literature—Jewish authors**, LCSH should use **Jewish-American literature**.(p. 116) No mention is made of all the parallel cases of need for such change, nor is any consideration given to the potential difficulties of making some such changes (e.g., to **Catholic-American literature** or to **Minority-American literature**). My own first concern is for systematicity, and as little as I see LC concerned for the same, I still do not agree that improvements of individual headings are to be pursued except insofar as they also further (or at least do not impair) such systematicity. The most important feature of the subject catalogue is (or at least ought to be) its intelligibility; but that derives from principles that do not, I fear, matter very much to Berman.

2.1 He would not, of course, agree with this judgment: intelligibility is indeed one of the three principles that Berman himself names as the bases of his ideas, and he exemplifies it in the dictum that "Bibliographic data—the substance and format of catalog entries—should be helpful to catalog users. And should make sense."(p. xi) But I hope to show here that the concept as he understands it is too narrow to do all that I would hope it could—he means by it only the obviousness of each semantic element of the cataloguing record. His attitude is manifested primarily in a dislike of many conventional locutions, especially abbreviations. The other two principles named by him are findability (which is exemplified in terms of a rich multiplicity of added entries framed in natural [i.e., obvious] terms),

and fairness (a concept that will be discussed at length later under the rubric of nonoffensive [i.e., noncritical] subject cataloguing). Naturalness stands behind all three of Berman's principles and is thus in truth his primary (meta)principle. But the hope that subject cataloguing can be so largely guided by naturalness runs aground on the indisputable fact that not only in classification is subject cataloguing nonnatural, but that a subject heading system is not natural language precisely to the extent that it is systematically self-defining, i.e., by means of syndesis.

2.2 What I interpret his three principles to be, operationally, are performance criteria more than principles of construction, and are as such not to be disputed: cataloguing (especially subject cataloguing), indeed should result in intelligible, findable and fair entries in a file similarly characterizable (with the three criteria standing in just that order of importance).

2.3 The principle I name as integration is the least central to Berman's effort, but finds its application in his salutary dislike of separate files for various forms and audience levels of materials.(cf. p. 6) However, his point brings him to an over-hasty rejection of many form-subdivisions of subject headings. In particular he rejects not only **Juvenile literature**,(pp.6, 152, 162) but many others as well. He advises, for instance, that "subheadings like—HANDBOOKS,MANUALS, ETC. and—UNITED STATES"[1] be used "on a selective basis depending on the library's collection."(p. 152) But not only is this advice highly suspect because it cannot but cause more work eventually, as well as being intrinsically erroneous in underspecifying[2] the document's "aboutness," it is also something that Berman himself shows to be a mistake in an analogous case. He shows that the growth of the collection may force the recataloguing of undercatalogued materials (in a review of a book which advises that media details be shown only when they are nonstandard for the medium in question)—which argument Berman counters with the point that such a procedure "could prove catastrophic if the library later expanded its stock of [nonstandard items]."(p. 190) But what applies in the one case does so equally well in the other.

2.4 His preference for the natural at all costs can be seen in his statements about the ideal (macro) form of the file as arising from the (micro) form of the entries making it up. Part of "The Cataloging Shtik" that we "don't need" is "hierarchical filing that wrongly assumes users know (or can guess) what mischievous librarians have decided to file first, last, and in the middle."(p. 4) I am doubtful that one of the most nonnatural filing conventions to be seen in almost every Anglo-American library catalogue is absent in that of the Hennepin County Library—namely the arrange-

ment of any identical forename of several emperors, popes, kings, and the like, not by the ordinal numbers that follow the name itself, but first by rank and then by area of sovereignty, and only then numerically. There is nothing mischievous about this; it is system for the sake of service.[3] Along the same line Berman argues that it is better to "follow natural word order, avoiding inversions."(p. 150) Such a practice impinges upon hierarchical order insofar as it would break up such a file as s.v. *Art* in LCSH9 i, 133b-142a/. But let us examine such a supposedly recondite distinction as that between a straight phrase heading like **Art therapy** and a subdivided use of the prepotent word as in **Art—Therapeutic use** (which could easily enough have been formed as a natural-order phrase such as **Therapeutic use of art**). To act as if the ordinary catalogue user is too insensitive to the sound of the language to recognize that the second is not a natural language phrase, that it has a caesura within it and is thus treated as consisting of two parts—to think that this is beyond our users is surely offensive enough to those users that Berman's desire not to offend anyone should make him repudiate it.

2.5 But when I look at exemplifications of his desire for fullness, I am far more inclined to be agreeable, though here too the results are far from systematic. He advocates, in addition to **I.Title [=Last night I saw Andromeda]**, also **II.Title: I saw Andromeda last night** and **III.Title: Andromeda last night**.(p. 16) In addition to [title main heading] **Wilson library bulletin,** also **I.Title: WLB** and **II.Title: Wilson Bulletin.**(p.33) In addition to **I.Title [=Shelanu, an Israel journey]**, also **II.Title: An Israel journey.**(p.118) But another example is even better because it shows that he is aware of the different handling necessary for initialisms and for acronyms. In addition to [title main heading] **Young adult alternative newsletter**, he traces **I.Title: YAAN** and also **II.Title: Y.A.A.N.**(p. 33) Why is this treatment not extended to WLB (i.e., as **III.Title: W.L.B.**), where it would be even more appropriate than WLB?

2.6 Why are there only two extra tracings of the title *Raise race rays raze*, not three (one for each of the three nonprepotent words), and why are the two extra ones that are given done in such an unsystematic way (**Rays race raze raise** and **Raze race rays raise**)?(p. 16) Why, if instead of an added entry for an unusual spelling, we are told to make a reference: **Rodgers, Mary** *x* Rogers, Mary,(p. 5) from the usual spelling (which is quite appropriate for author variants), and are told to make an extra entry (**II.Title: Mahagonny**) for Weill's opera,(p. 6) are we not told to make another extra entry (**III.Title: Mahagony**) for the catalogue user unaware of the usual spelling? Why are we not told that the reason for the second title entry for **Shelanu** is not just because "some title searchers might forget the first word,"(p.118) but

because the intelligible title should be entered as well as the memorable? (Almost every proper name is at once memorable and, because not intrinsically intelligible, forgettable as well; whereas intelligible titles (parts) are more likely to be retained, though unfortunately all too often in a transformation that preserves the meaning but sheds the word clothing originally worn.)

3 Lack of Familiarity with General "Scholarly" Practice and with Theoretical Foundations

In the examples above, as elsewhere, Berman's intention is good: to make the library's collection more accessible through a richer provision of added entries. But also as elsewhere the results of the intention are somewhat random, rather than being systematic. The shortcoming seems to me to lie in his lack of a well-developed theory of cataloguing (which would need to include a stout component of the purpose of and need for access consonant with the information needs of the population served). He advocates(p. 117) the tracing of two titles contained in a short-story collection, but does not tell us the background point that is so crucial to our seeing whether what he advocates is enough (i.e., whether he is being systematic): (1) is the collection all by one author (which, if true, would obviate the need not just for title tracings but for author/title tracings as well)? and (2) are these two stories of considerably greater value or interest to readers than the rest of the collection? and if so, why? and most of all, how can a principle be erected to allow for appropriate decisions of this sort in other cases? We have already seen the need for principles upon which to base decisions in such a case as *Wilson Library Bulletin*; it does not do enough (even for Berman himself!) to have such adages ringing in the cataloguer's head as, "make added entries for variant and popular forms of title,"(p. 29) or that AACR2 itself "mandat[es] more title added-entries"(p. 11).

3.1 Berman is an iconoclast, and to say so is not to condemn him; but the icons he would like to break are so often so inappropriate for the sacrifice that one wonders how he arrived at them. Examples of opposition to various abbreviations spring to mind: "Do not use brackets, slashes, and equal signs,"(p. 15) even though brackets are universally (not just in libraries) accepted as indicators of editorial interpolation or expansion. Slashes are widely (especially in mathematics) verbalized as "by," and the equal sign universally means "*A* means *B*, but states it under another symbolization." He wants to dump "the mystifying 'ca.'"(p. 19)—mystifying to whom? Even Ann Landers or *Popular Mechanics* would surely use it when called for. Perhaps he is right that *c* does not mean "copyright" to all, but then let us get cataloguers' typewriters with ©,

rather than doing as he wants by giving the whole word every time.(p. 23) And one of the examples he calls "relatively well recognized"(p. 23) truly is ambiguous—namely *Co.*(p. 23)—does it mean "county"or "company," out of context?

4 Berman's Attitudes on Descriptive Cataloguing and His Attack on AACR2

This last is a large part of the reason for much of his carping about AACR2 and ISBD(M), too: context—or rather the lack of it. He wants, it seems, for people to be able to know what a symbol or abbreviation means out of context, and fails to see that since such symbols and abbreviations are seen in catalogue entries in a very specific sort of context (namely "the bibliographical"), they can often be understood as soon as that context is adverted to. He criticizes Gorman's attempt to show the intelligibility of ISBD(M) format and punctuation in what is one of the most crucial moments of the book, thus:

> the *questions* employed [i.e., by Gorman]—e.g. "Is this book illustrated?" or "What is the subtitle?"—inevitably prejudice the results. That is, the questions themselves tend to induce "correct" answers. For instance, it's a very different matter to ask "an ordinary user" what "ill." means (in context) than to ask: Is this book illustrated?(p. 200)

4.1 The theory upon which Berman would design a test whose results he would accept as valid would be one in which no question could be called "leading." For instance, "what does 'ill.' mean in this catalogue entry?" Note that Berman does explicitly, even if only parenthetically, allow the establishment of context. But his objections are not all on the same level. Though there may well be those unable to answer the first question as reformulated, no one who understands what a subtitle is could fail to answer the second question, however reformulated,[4] as long as the entry is in a language understood by the person questioned. This is perhaps not a representative sample of Gorman's questions, so it may well be true that if most of his questions are leading his results are invalid. But the two questions quoted are not merely representative but exhaustive of Berman's—and his case is, therefore, not proven against Gorman as Berman thinks it is (a "vote" of one valid *v.* one invalid question cannot decide the matter): "the 'study' does not prove that *ISBD* aids, rather than halts, the understanding and speed of use of descriptive data as compared with pre-ISBD descriptions."(p. 200) (This does not, of course, mean that I am convinced that the case for ISBD(M) has been, or can be, made; but the case against it must, if it is to hold, be made on stronger grounds than Berman has presented.)

4.2 Some of Berman's (Hennepin County Library's) exceptions from AACR2 in choice of headings are laudable. He does not simply lie down and let the juggernaut roll over him when usefulness is better served by exceptions: "enter generic, nondistinctive titles...under the responsible corporate body,"(p. 29) rather than invariably making title words prepotent; avoid such entries as **E.I. DuPont** [...] and **R.R. Bowker**[...](p.22) both because they tend to produce filing problems and because they are more likely to be remembered by the word-part of the name than by the initial-part; and avoid title main entry for collections compiled/edited by a known person or persons: "Some research on information gathering behavior suggests that when a personal name is known to be associated with a given work, it's the name, not the title, that's sought."(p. 21) And in the examples on the next page he shows that he's aware of the need for subfile searchability by a recognized heading.[5]

4.3 In addition to such generally sensible decisions on choice of entry, Berman expresses himself on what he considers an appropriate form of heading and on references from variant to established forms of heading (and is often less reliable in these two subordinate areas). Perhaps, as he argues, the comma is the more common American means of setting off qualifying place names from the target place name when addressing envelopes(p. 25) (in preference to the AACR2 parentheses around the qualifier), but the AACR2 style here seems to me to appropriately mimic the long standing LCSH qualifier style. And his choice of the outright initialistic **Lawrence, D.H., 1885-1930** over the compromising **Lawrence, D.H. (David Herbert), 1885-1930**(p. 16) seems eminently good for the public catalogue (though it is only by inference that we can conclude that he would retain the full name where it is useful—namely in the authority file).(cf. p. 19) Again, it is surprising that he allows the heading **United States. Volunteers in Service to America** to be the established heading rather than the more popular VISTA (96), since for him popular equals correct as long as it's not also offensive.

4.4 But it is only when we come to references from variant to established forms of heading that we see fully how wide of the mark Berman's lack of solid theoretical foundations lets him get. To refer to **Bible. O.T.** from the variants **Bible, Jewish** and **Jewish Bible**(p. 115) is unexceptionable, but why not also from **Torah**, despite the flexibility of scope of that word?

4.5 To refer to **Minnesota Vikings** from **Vikings (Minnesota football team)** is surely OK, but to do so also from nicknames such as **Vikes (Minnesota football team)**(p. 16) seems unconscionably to ignore the obviousness of the equivalence by slang-derivation. Is there really any football fan who

would not know that "Vikes" derives from "Vikings?" And who but a fan would use such slang-names? But the fun becomes wholly unconfineable when we see that Berman doesn't trust his users to know the difference between name and rank, when he makes references to **Amin Dada, Idi, 1925-** not from the most likely variant entry word, **Idi [...]**, but from **Dada [...]**, which is OK, but also from **General Amin, 1925-** and from **President Amin,1925-** !(p. 5) He could easily have found a case where a large number of users would not know the name but would know the rank, and where the ignorance would be legitimately explained by the foreignness of the rank-word. Such a case would be **Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, Shah [...]**, but such an explanation does not apply to the grotesquerie of General Amin, etc. Grotesque because to make such a reference, in this one case, of a fully understood rank-word would imply that the same would have to be done across the board in the cases of all other generals and presidents, unless there were something obviously unusual about this one case (as would be true for "the Shah," whose name many people never knew—is Amin commonly referred to as "the General" or "the President"?). That could prevent the automatic generalization of the technique.

4.6 Before I get back to subject cataloguing per se, I wish to commend Berman for a point he makes about the cataloguing of periodicals, namely in recommending an explicit note saying, e.g., "Began publication in 1972"(p. 31) (with holdings information in a separate file), so that no confusion can arise from the "holdings statement"—called for by most cataloguing codes—being misinterpreted as necessarily identical to the statement of inception. It is not equally clear, however, whether the elaborate note about editors and previous titles is (as given in the example on p. 33) because Hennepin County Library actually holds all the volumes of which that information would be true, or is given just out of (useless, indeed misleading) force of habit.

5 Critical Classification—The Problem of Offensive Headings

By far the problem dealt with at greatest length by Berman is that of headings offensive to groups of persons, or the treatment of books in a manner that might offend either the author or users of the library.

5.1 Let me state some general principles before I examine the text; principles which I uphold and to which Berman would probably give assent:

1. assignment of books to subject classes and of subject headings to books is done ideally without malice or derogation; even, indeed, without judgment being passed as to the success or failure of the author in proving (etc.) what he/she *claims* to have proven (etc.); and

2. the class-code or subject heading chosen for each book should be one that can be predicted for that use by users and staff, by virtue of the cataloguing having focused on the publicly-obvious content of the book, and by the use of a citation-order formula or an order of precedence built into the system of classification or of subject headings. Langridge puts these points well by arguing that "any form of knowledge or experience supported by men not generally regarded as maniacs or charlatans must be taken at its own valuation."[6] It will be noted that Langridge does allow for a judgment—by the cataloguer—of authorial honesty and good will (or the lack thereof). He also argues by implication that what the author *claims* he/she is doing should be taken at face value: "for bibliographic classification we need characteristics that are not hard to discern and that give rise to a large measure of agreement among those with adequate knowledge of the field concerned."(p. 35) That is, the work is to be judged by the standards of its own discipline/genre; is to be classified/subject-headed in terms of what is true of it according to some sort of majority judgment; and these judgments of the work are to be applied by the cataloguer in consort with "those with adequate knowledge." It is almost amusing (but, in fact, rather depressing) that this argument of Langridge's is made largely to prevent astrological works being relegated to the critical ash heap of popular superstition, while Berman, who would probably uphold Langridge's argument in the abstract, is very negatively judgmental about the whole area of the occult (cf. the Cezanne case below), and especially of astrology(cf. p. 173).

5.2 Berman would probably argue for a third principle in addition to my (1) and (2), namely—(3) establishment of subject headings and class-memberships within classes should be done so as not to offend the members of any class of persons named in a subject heading or grouped with other classes of persons in a hierarchy of class-codes with whom they would object to being grouped. This leads him to prefer **Inuit** to **Eskimos**(p. 83), **Third World** to **Underdeveloped areas**,(pp. 67, 107) **Seniors** to **Aged**,(pp. 99, 101) **San (African people)** to **Bushmen**,(p. 74) **English as a second language** to **English language—Textbooks for foreigners**.(p. 98) Much of this seems eminently reasonable; but note that even without the external pressure of AACR2 he is in favor of the use of author headings that conform to the "predominant [form of] name" rule—even for classical authors who would not recognize the form of name applied to them by such a rule. So a contradiction arises: living persons (especially classes of the oppressed) seem to qualify—in Berman's mind—to have the right to name themselves, no matter how small their "vote" be against that of the common usage (i.e., the usage of the whole remainder of the population);

whereas dead persons (especially mere individuals who have created literary works of perennial interest) are to be subjected to whatever form of name has become "predominant" among their modern publishers (not, be it carefully noted, among their readers, and especially not among those capable of reading their works as they were written—i.e., in the original languages). Here, then, the majority "vote" is determinative. But not only is Berman's logic hardly flawless, his facts are not always beyond dispute.

5.3 He argues that *Bushmen* is a derogatory Afrikaans term meaning "stunted representatives of humanity,"(p. 75) relying on the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*; but this testimony is countered by the definition in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*[7] where *Bushmen* is derived from Dutch originals that denote merely those who dwell in the bush—which is not, indeed, truly a name, but is not, by the same token, offensive in any primary sense. And even the source he relies upon for his own derivation is cast into doubt by the derivation presented in its larger parent work, the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* itself, namely from the Dutch term meaning "natives living in the 'bush'"(p. i 1204a). What Berman gave out as the definition of *Bushmen*, namely, "stunted representatives of humanity" is not given in the *OED* as a definition or even a name at all, but rather as a description quoted from the *Foreign Quarterly Review* (vol. 24 [1845], 421)—"Stunted representatives of humanity...under the name of Bushmen." Another quotation in the same article makes it clear that the name is (1) geographical/topographical, not quasi-physiological, as well as (2) not Afrikaans in origin: "Crowds of Bushmen, as those who live in the interior are called by their brethren of the coast"(i, p. 204b, quoting from *Chamber's Journal*, 4 Dec. 1880, p. 774). From this last we can speculate that the Afrikaans term that stands behind the English term was a translation of geographical/topographical terms used by those Blacks whom the Europeans encountered first—a situation analogous to the variance between "Sioux" (the name applied to them by North American Indians encountered first by European-American explorers and settlers) and "Dakota" (their own name for themselves).[8]

5.4 While not arguing that certain ethnic terms are not or cannot become offensive to the classes of persons so named, it must be kept clearly and perpetually present in mind that *no* controlled bibliographical indexing language, any more than any bibliographical classification system, is a natural language. This being so, it is more important, even to a member of a class of persons named in an offensive way, that they be assured that that name accurately indicates the documents relevant to themselves as a class than that it do so with words pleasing to themselves. To quote from another work of my own:

> The British Museum catalogue refers to the Catholic Church, the so-called "Roman" Catholic Church, as **Rome, Church of.** Whether it offends me as a Catholic (not, I insist, just a "Roman" Catholic, since "Catholic" can hardly be locally qualified by anyone who knows what it means and has always meant in Christianity) is of little concern as long as what is so listed is indeed by or about the Catholic Church. Less than offended, I am amused at the linguistic tendency that being members of the Church *of England* (or even only of being in an institution that is part of the English establishment and that thus may have an inherent predilection for the Church of England) seems to have given to the nomenclatorial faculty of the minds of British Museum cataloguers—i.e., to think more or less automatically of the Church *of Rome* alongside their own established Church *of England*, etc.
>
> Whether one refers to it as the "Catholic Church," the "Roman Catholic Church," or **Rome, Church of**, one organization is denoted which is entirely continuous and unitary with what is also denoted by either of the other two names....[9]

And that this, rather than the appropriateness of the name as such, is the crux of the matter.

5.5 Let me put the following questions to Berman: How is the cataloguer to know whether **Finns** is offensive to those who might prefer to refer to themselves by some word derived from "Suomi?" Shall he/she go ahead and use **Finns** even if no answer to the question can be readily found? or let the book wait till such an answer can be found? Is the cataloguer to agree to use, instead of "terrorists," whatever term those persons commonly so called would apply to themselves (anarchists, urban guerrillas, freers of the oppressed, restorers of power to the people)?[10] While Berman's defense of the oppressed against those who would linguistically denigrate them cannot be less than admired in the humanitarian sense, the point seems to me to be that all this polemic tends to obscure the real and central point of subject cataloguing, namely the indicating of the relevant. If it does that it has achieved its purpose; but if (as embodied in LCSH and in LC's actual performance as provider of subject-cataloguing decisions) it fails in that, much more concern needs to be directed toward solving that problem than toward the elimination of offensive vocabulary. At least let us not waste our limited strength on matters of such secondary importance as long as primary flaws are still to be seen on all sides. (Berman's review of Chan's excellent book on LCSH shows his own attitude well: He faults her for her primary concern for "morphology."[p. 196])

6 A Case Study in Offensive/Critical Subject Cataloguing

Berman argues against classing a book of spirit writings alleged by its author to be "by" Cezanne with "normal" books by and about the painter, on the principles that:

—material should be classed where browsers would most likely *seek* it;
—similar material should be found in the same or nearby Dewey ranges; and
—material should not be classed in such a way that it seems to be something that it really isn't.(p. 171)

It will be noted, I think, that these principles, taken together, show Berman to be a long way from letting the author's stated intent be determinative—it would seem that Berman would strongly endorse Langridge's idea of the cataloguer of the cataloguer's judgment on authorial honesty and goodwill. (It does not necessarily imply that Berman would characterize all such authors of whom he disapproves as "maniacs and charlatans," nor do I imply that Langridge's principle of cataloguer judgment is appropriately exemplified here.)

6.1 But I maintain that Berman's principle of similarity is too blunt to dissect this problem (or to do so for the majority of such problems). It is as true that to class this book with Cezanne *is* to put it with similar books as it is that to class it with spirit writings *is also* to put it with similar books. The question is: which similarity is determinative? Here can be seen the value of part of my principle (2): "an order of precedence built into the system..." since without such an order of precedence there is no guarantee that the next case analogous to this one will be handled the same way (whichever way is chosen as being most useful).

6.2 The way Berman would choose is obvious: give precedence to spirit writings, not to the purported spirit author or to the purported subject of the book. Fine: this is the same as Ranganathan's idea of "specials" and "systems"—variant ways of looking either at some part of the universe of knowledge, or even of the whole of it. In medicine, for instance, homeopathy is a "system" such that every book on homeopathic treatment of cancer would be in a subdivision of homeopathy rather than being in the non-"system" cancer part of the main class. Gynecology is a "special" object such that every book on cancer of the female genitals would be in a subdivision of gynecology rather than being in the non-"special" cancer part of the main class.

6.3 Spirit writing is not generally taken, in Dewey, as such a "special" or "system," but there is of course no objection to so taking it in the cataloguing and/or classification of a particular collection. This sort of thing can be done anywhere that it is seen as advantageous (as for instance at my own institution, where archaeology is kept together rather than being a scatter of specifications subordinate to the places treated archaeologically—i.e., at UAH (University of Alabama at Huntsville) the places are used as specifi-

cations within archaeology). This is equivalent to making spirit writing (or, probably, that to which spirit writing belongs subdisciplinarily, namely the occult) a main class.[11]

6.4 But it seems that the negative attitude of Berman toward the occult is the (chthonic) foundation for his decision. I draw this conclusion from the following counter example, that of Peter Schickele's *Definitive Biography of P.D.Q. Bach*, which is subject-headed by LC **1. Music—Anecdotes, facetiae, satire, etc. 2.Biography—Anecdotes, facetiae, satire, etc.**, and classed 813.54 (American fiction since 1945). This would seem to exemplify well enough Berman's own attitudes as shown toward the spirit-written Cezanne: Schickele doesn't mean to write anything but a spoof, and spoofery is literary But the fact is that at Hennepin County Library the thing is treated to **1. Music—Anecdotes, facetiae, satire, etc. 2. Bach, P.D.Q., 1807-1742—fiction 3.Bach Family—Cartoons, satire, etc. 4. Composers, German—Anecdotes, facetiae, satire, etc.**, and classed 780.207 or 817.54 (Musical miscellany or American satire since 1945).(p. 8) In other words, it is given the same treatment (except for the alternative class number) that would be given to the biography of any of the real members of the Bach family, despite the fact that in this case (as against that of the spirit-written Cezanne book) the thesis of the book is *not* actually maintained by its author as true.

6.4 I cannot, of course, argue that as long as there is no internal evidence of falsehood, the cataloguer should accept the book's thesis as (bibliographically) "true." To do so would be to give such subject headings as **1.Leverkühn, Adrian, 1885-1940. 2. Composers, German—Biography**[12] to Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus: The Life of the German Composer Adrian Leverkühn as Told to a Friend* (which uses not even one word on the title page to give away its novelistic status—nor does the German original—though the translator's note reveals the deception), just because it so thoroughly maintains its "truth" about the "life" of "Leverkühn." There is no doubt that Langridge is right to leave the final decision to the judgment of the cataloguer—but, for such judgment to be reliable, it must be informed by principles that guarantee uniform application of the criteria. So once again we see that Berman's ideas, while often focusing upon a real problem and leading to improvements in this or that case, are not systematic and thus end up being a mirage solution rather than a true and effective one.

6.5 Even here Berman's practice can be taken as the basis for generalization that is effective: he prefers, for the Cezanne book, the more specific subject heading(s) **Spirit writing** (LCSH) or **Automatic writing (Psychic phenomena)** (Hennepin County Library) to LC's actual heading **Psychical**

research.(p. 173) But the principle to which this generalizes is one that is upheld, at least theoretically, by LC, though in this case it was ignored—use the most specific heading appropriate to the book being catalogued. Thus Berman's suggestion is a proof of no more than his sharp eye for mistakes in LCSH applications emanating from LC—a talent that's in great need!

7 Offensiveness—Conclusion

What seems to me to be the problem with Berman in general—his lack of concern for systematicity—is exacerbated in the case of offensive and critical subject headings and classings by a righteous indignation that puts him on the side of those offended, but also gives rise to a polemical response that often entails losing sight of the real point. When he argues for **Third World** in cases where LC gives **Underdeveloped areas** in a specifically economic context,(p. 107) he allows sympathy for the inhabitants of such regions to get in the way of a heading that is precisely appropriate (and the same applies to **Seniors** as preferred to **Aged**: such persons are in fact singled out as objects of study by reason of their age; to apply the euphemism will not reverse the process of aging however much it may help these persons forget the fact). When he argues that the basis of giving up the Christocentric attitude toward all religions is that "Christocentrism unquestionably violates the 'Establishment Clause' of the First Amendment"(p. 116) he is confusing politics with information retrieval and rhetoric with truth. Surely he does not imagine that American cataloguers are actually manifesting a vital preference for Christianity, rather than just going along with the prevalent Western bias of which Christianity is a part—analogous to the British Museum cataloguers' bias toward the established church.

7.1 When he argues that **Homosexuals** is derogatory and should become **Gays**(p. 110) he is issuing a political manifesto, not looking at the subject headings themselves either as semiotic or as elements of an information language. Surely it is better and less offensive to all for the partition to be between the same-sex preferrers and the other-sex preferrers (which is precisely what the words mean) than between the (gay = happy and interesting) minority and the (nongay = unhappy, dull and insipid) majority.

7.2 When he treats **Jewish question, Yellow peril**, and **Mammies** as being equaled in odiousness by **Aged**,(p. 62) when he argues that **Yellow peril** "could easily be replaced by 'current terminology,'"(p. 68) he is acting as if history means nothing; as if all headings should be subjected to the

perceptions of a particular moment in time and as if the past did not ever really exist. He seems unaware that there are other members of the "New Left" in American subject cataloguing who would argue for the retention of such historically outdated headings, appropriately dated, precisely to show when they were alive and that they are now only relics.

7.3 When he argues that "'Races' is clearly an anachronism—no longer sound anthropologically"(p. 64)—or that **Mediterranean race**, **Teutonic race**, and **Mongoloid race** are "absurd, inaccurate and derogatory headings,"(p. 106) we can see that his focus of attack is not bibliothecal practice but rather the structure of the perception of reality among groups of people; for one who argues that "race" is an invalid concept and yet who cannot ever forget the fact of "the ethnic," the problem is the perception of differences which he would like somehow to make us all forget—in effect he urges us all to stop being members of dangerously antagonistic "races" and instead to start rejoicing in our colorfully interesting ethnicities. But this is to forget the origins of dangerous antagonisms in mere differences: mankind is not (if history means anything) innocent and good, whatever be the hopes of utopians. The very criticism of "Hottentot" as meaning "'stutterer' or 'stammerer'"(p. 70) is just the modern echo of the Greek derogation of all non-Greek speakers as "barbarians"—i.e., those who bark like dogs. When he is willing to go so far as to impugn the fairness of those who do not agree with his program of utopian revision of the language, by referring to "the macho [subject heading] MAN,"(p. 62) there is no hope of compromise. Either we accede to his ideal, or know that we shall be branded as "macho" just for the very attempt at compromise. When will we be required to change not just catalogue entries but even the title pages of books? Woe to the library still offending its readers with *The Nigger of the Narcissus*!

7.4 Still, even Berman's linguistic utopianism has its own chinks. Are not those referred to by him as **Hillbilly musicians**(p. 87) offended (or may they not become so in the near future)? And are the speakers of them not likely to object to the "merely descriptive" (but, to me, pejoratively tinged) equivalence posited in **Khoi language** *x* "Click" languages,(p. 76) with its suggestion of definition of some few languages in terms of their having to resort to nonbreathed "noises"? Are not some Jews offended by being associated with **Ghettoes**?(p. 114)

7.5 Rather than reiterating my overall stand (as enunciated just ahead of the beginning of the "Case Study"), I shall ask three questions of Berman in regard to his position that, "catalog users should (ideally) be able to reach desired subjects on their first try[;] and should not be offended,

prejudiced, confused, misled, or repelled by the very terminology used to denote specific topics."(p. 110)

—Whose being offended, etc. should we primarily seek to prevent?

—Whose first try should we maximize?

—How often (and under what circumstances) should change to avoid offense etc. and to maximize first tries be made?

8 The System of Subject Headings

Does Berman understand LCSH as a system, or are his criticisms oriented only to particular headings within it? He seems to grasp the bases of construction of a system of subject headings in arguing that "a special thesaurus rooted in the material itself must necessarily be devised to fairly and usefully represent [any special subject's] topics."(p. 58) But while this is true of a special subject and its thesaurus, is it equally true of a general thesaurus? How do we go about analyzing "the material itself" when it is everything?

8.1 We can wonder, in the text below, whether Berman is adequately separating (a) the questionable tactic of waiting for literary warrant before establishment of a new subject heading, (b) the need for headings more general than some of the books to which they are applied in a system like LCSH (with its low level of allowance of ad hoc synthe is guided by explicit "rules of formation"), in order to indicate subject in books that are (b,1) sometimes separate parts of those books and (b,2) sometimes elements of a complex statement not formulable under the implicit rules of formation, and (c) the temptation to assign available headings to a book rather than to analyze the system of headings so as to establish new syndetic relations between them which at least could eliminate the need for some such headings, by leading from (general or collateral) topic(s) to which document D is relevant (though it is not about them) to the actual (specific) topic(s) of D. He alludes in a nondistinguishing way to most of these points when he writes:

> It's welcome news that LC is "making an attempt to give wider use to such terms as RETIREMENT...even when the book is not about retirement per se." Bravo! But one paragraph earlier came the announcement that "in the LC system we have only headings that have been used to designate the contents of *entire* books...." The two statements not only don't harmonize, but inevitably raise the not-so-innocent question: If an established heading like RETIREMENT can be legitimately assigned to a work that's "not about retirement per se," why can't descriptors like AGEISM and SENIOR POWER be innovated and applied to works that aren't about ageism and senior power per se?(pp. 101-02)

Why, indeed, "Bravo!"? Would that not be analogous to giving the heading **Aged** to books which are not about that topic per se, but are rather about, say, **Conflict of generations** or **Interpersonal relations**? (They are, after all, at least relevant.) And what has all this use of available headings (for purposes legitimate or illegitimate) to do with the need for new headings? And why in the world ask for new headings for books that (by Berman's own statement!) are not even about the topics named in such headings?

8.2 But this may be too specialized a case to allow us to decide from it about Berman's general attitude toward, and understanding of, LCSH or about subject heading work as such. He approves of an author he is reviewing who feels "that while LCSH ought to be scuttled, it probably won't be, and thus must be reformed."(p. 190) Berman does not say what the reviewed author proposes as the substitute, nor does he give his own vote—could it be PRECIS (Preserved Context Index System)? In any case, the prospect of such a new start (whether as a result of scuttling or of reformulation) is not examined at length, so we cannot know how Berman would propose to attack the problem except that he implies more approval of reformulation than of scuttling when he says that, "the best way to improve subject access and equity in your own library is to locally undertake as many reforms as your resources allow. For instance, in no event can LC—no matter how enlightened--make necessary cross-references in *your* catalogue."(p. 120)

8.3 That this sounds radically unsystematic ("plug up as many holes in the old scow as you come across—but don't try to build a new one!") may be excused by the explicit restriction to "your own library." In other words, were Berman at the helm of something more far-reaching in its impact than any mere local library, wider reforms based on a deeper look might well be proposed.

9 Berman on Syndesis

But since we can only guess at this, a good place to look for systematic revisionism would be to consider Berman's ideas on that preeminent basis of structure in the subject catalogue, the authority file, and at its vivifying principle, syndesis. (He does, after all, seem to be in favor of cross-references, as shown in the last quotation.) Unfortunately he is silent on the authority file except to publish here his "Model Authority File for Names, Subjects, and Dewey Numbers," based on "1970-80 additions and changes at Hennepin County Library."(pp. 210-21) It seems to be adequate to its purpose, but casts little light on our question. Almost his only theoretical statement about syndesis is a defense of the prohibition of the

special-to-general *see also* reference: "The reason for few (if any) superordinate *see also* references in subject catalogues is never stated and so made to seem unreasonable, if not even perverse. But it makes good sense: namely, that such references are potentially 'blind.'"(p. 199) This is a justification that can be accepted, though he is far from right about the reason never being stated. But he makes no provision for the syndesis needed between including and included places when he opts for direct specialization of topic by place (e.g., between **Agriculture—Italy** and **Agriculture—Sicily**.[p. 152]) Nor does the "Model Authority File" even bother to tell whether topical headings may or may not be specialized by place (those that are given with specialization by place are given, just as in LCSH, merely so that a *see*-reference to each such can be set up).

9.1 He gives *see*-references to **United States. Occupational Safety and Health Administration** from both the acronymic and the initialistic forms of its name as well as from the name **Occupational Safety and Health Administration**.(p. 5) but omits the hierarchical reference necessary from **United States. Department of Labor. Occupational Safety and Health Administration** (which is given in the 1973-77 cumulation of the Library of Congress' *National Union Catalog*, vol. 122, p. 368).

9.2 He drops *x* in favor of *sf* (see from), (p. 210) but retains *xx* instead of making it *saf* (see also from).

9.3 He is repeatedly in favor of generic posting, never considering (at least not in this volume) the possibility that the same benefit could be conferred upon catalogue users, without over rapid growth of the file, by the use of judicious syndetics. (His enthusiam for the technique strikes me as being more appropriate to the "lockstep followers" of the Library of Congress than of an innovator.) For example, he advocates, in addition to a heading for Pelé, **Afro-Brazilian athletes** (p. 107)—but not the far more specific **Afro-Brazilian soccer players** (parallel to the LCSH available **Afro-American basketball players**). Again, in addition to the heading for the name of the Jewish scholar Judah Löw ben Bezalel, he asks "where's the explicitly 'Jewish' entry [access] point? Missing"(pp. 119-20)—i.e., missing from the Library of Congress cataloguing copy for the work. But he does not consider the establishment of a *see also* reference from **Jewish authors** to **Judah Löw ben Bezaleel, d. 1609**[13] and to all other such persons who are instances of that topic.

9.4 He objects to posting a book on Kung Fu under **Karate**; though he admits that LC calls for a *see* reference from the special to the general, he worries that not all catalogues would bother to avail themselves of this useful advice.(p. 91) What Berman is objecting to, here, is over-general

posting rather than generic posting (which he accepts: see above). He similarly objects to **Feminism** for books on the Women's Liberation Movement,(p. 93) which, first though appropriately objected to in 1974 when the paper was delivered, seems now quite in keeping with current usage.

9.5 He argues that "definitionally, 'Literature, Immoral' cannot be fully equated—as the *x*'s currently do—with either 'Obscene literature' or 'Pornography.'"(p. 69) But this conclusion ignores the fact that since LCSH is not a natural language, its fabricators are in total charge of definition of the headings that make it up—definition by what includes each heading and what it includes, i.e., by syndesis. But Berman both shows that he does not accept this fact, and shows his own attitude, in the definition of pornography which he proposes, "more precisely, sexually explicit material." While this is a definition far from acceptable to many parties concerned (and acceptable to others, in a pejorative sense!), he compounds the problem of whether his definition can be accepted by going on to say that sexually explicit material "is not *ipso facto* 'immoral.'" Though I happen to agree with this, it is not accepted by all—especially not by LC, precisely insofar as LC has itself defined pornography (i.e., sexually explicit material of a certain sort) as obscene—i.e., immoral. And Berman does the same sort of thing himself (that is, he defines by syndesis, in a way that is not fully acceptable to all), when he sets up the relation **Unification Church** *xx* [i.e., xx...] Christian sects,(p. 221) which means that the Moonies are specified as one of the groups generalized in the superordinate heading. This would seem to me to carry the point about acceptance of all self-references to the point of absurdity. If I set up a church tomorrow and name it The High Kabbalistic Fellowship of the Torah, does that make it *ipso facto* a Jewish sect?

10 What Would Berman do about Subject Headings?

Despite the lack of theoretical statements, despite the lack of conscious exemplification (i.e., acceptance) of the inevitable fact of self-definition by syndesis in a controlled subject-heading system, Berman makes good suggestions for the improvement of such a system. He suggests subject headings for fictional characters likely to be sought.(pp. 115, 153-55) But he does not give the appropriate differentiation in practice between a subject heading for a real person and one for a fictional person. The result is not only the inappropriate P.D.Q. Bach heading (which makes it seem equivalent to a heading for a real person), but also "his" inappropriate promotion to "membership" in the Bach family (in the other headings for that book).

10.1 He suggests headings for ethnic groups as members of an adopted country—e.g., **Jewish-Americans**, not merely **Jews in the United States**(p. 114). It is not clear whether he would suggest a change from **Jews in the Ukraine—Persecutions** to **Jewish-Ukrainians—Persecutions**.(p. 116) Is it not true that persecution follows upon the persecuted group being seen by their persecutors as *not being* (e.g.) Ukrainians?

10.2 He suggests subject headings for children's fiction—e.g., **Peaceableness** for *Ferdinand the Bull*. He does not (as would be expected, given his general lack of concern for systematicity) counsel such headings for adult fiction as well, nor does he show awareness of the extraordinary difficulty of such an undertaking, however valuable.

10.3 But he makes, too, a good many simple missteps. He attacks headings such as **Literature, Immoral** (when used for an "erotic novel or volume of poetry,"[p 69] as against its subject use for a study of erotic novels or poetry), but defends such headings as **Israeli fiction**,(p. 118) when used for an individual instance of that genre-cum-nationality. While I agree with his negative advice, I do not do so because (as he puts it) "that would be 'labeling,' not cataloguing"(p. 69)—his positive advice just as much involves labeling, but labeling is part of cataloguing. Surely no one would think that because such headings point out embodiments of this or that sort of literature that they tell us what those books are about just because such headings look like subject headings. What we call subject cataloguing is in fact a congeries of subject and form cataloguing. (It would have been nice of Berman, too, to have told his readers that while LC doesn't give such form tracings as **Israeli fiction** on its printed cards, such genre-cum-nationality headings at least used to be printed in the Subject Catalog.) It's neither good nor bad to use such headings because such use is "labeling," but bad in one case because it is derogatory, critical and good in the other because it is neutral and informative.

10.4 He makes substitutions that can scarcely be called improvements, insofar as they involve subject headings of enormously greater generality than the documents referred to by them: **Decentralization in government—U.S.** becomes **Decentralization** for Seldman's *Common Sense Radicalism*,(p.129) and **Jews—Public opinion** becomes **Misconceptions** for Goldberg's *Just Because They're Jewish*. How are these different from **Karate** for **Kung Fu**?

10.5 And at least some of his substitutions, made in the name of naturalness of vocabulary, result in ambiguities without any simultaneous remedy by means of qualifications: **Endowments** becomes **Foundations**,(p.

149) **Phonorecords** becomes **Records**, and **Phonotapes** becomes **Tapes**.(p. 127)

10.6 I shall now leave the subject-heading issue with this example of less-then-full application: In an index to the contents of a single issue, each of 12 sex periodicals (and interesting example of a special thesaurus, of course, had to be worked up for it), there is a contribution listed with the title "The Lady Who Loved Horses"(p. 43)—and I am not a little surprised, given the presence of the subject heading **Beastiality** (with such titles posted under it as "Doggie-Do" [a letter]), that our diligent indexer did not establish the connection. (Of course it can also be asked whether this heading be not offensive to those whose sexual preference it represents. Why not use the disallowed heading **Animal love** and make **Beastiality** its disallowed synonym?)

11 Berman on the Dewey Decimal Classification

A considerable sensitivity to an awareness of what classification can do and of how well DDC does it is to be found in this volume. For instance, Berman writes with careful discrimination that "The *Dewey Decimal Classification* is doubtless the best available scheme for nonresearch libraries"(p. 167) and, probably from long personal experience, that: "In open-stack libraries—public, school or college—classification performs *one* primary function: It allows patrons (and staff) to successfully 'retrieve' material in particular genres and subject areas by browsing, without first making a catalog search."(p. 177) Indeed, except for computerized retrieval,[14] this is the sole functional advantage of a shelf classification over any nonmeaning-bearing mark-and-park system (e.g., classification by size; accession numbers). So he is again absolutely in the right to argue that "each local *DDC*-using library [must itself ensure] that successive revisions and overlays don't generate a senseless mishmash on the shelves."(p. 167) Though he shows no awareness that this is quite as much a problem with systems that, like LCC, do not issue more or less regular new editions of the whole schedule, but are instead in a constant process of revision that needs to be either retrospectively applied or consciously rejected. And he seems to see that the meaning of each code in a hierarchy is dependent upon the "branch" of the "tree" that it inhabits, when he argues against classing Castaneda's possibly fraudulently anthropological books among those on Yaqui Indians,(p. 175) against classing a book on sports handicapping among books on gambling,(p. 169) in the Cezanne case mentioned above,(p. 171) and when he argues against several subjects being "wantonly transferred" from the 300s to the 600s and from the 600s to the 300s.(p. 179)

11.1 When he encounters a book patently wrongly-classified at the LC Dewey Office, he assigns to it a new number, one not used (as regards its terminal digits), arguing that "we hope" that the number assigned means what the book has been analyzed to be about; an official at LC is quoted as responding to this thus: "I would like to remonstrate mildly your practice of establishing new numbers without knowing whether we are establishing the same number or a different one or none."(p. 170) This response is a nearly perfect example of the lockstep mentality that Berman righteously (and rightly!) protests against. One of the major reasons for preferring DDC over LCC is just this—that the former is far more likely to be correctly expandable in just this way. The attitude of the official could eventually (unfortunately!) turn DDC into as inflexible and totalitarian a monolith as LCC already is, thus seriously damaging its status as a classification that can be used, not merely bought, as a system that is use-ful! both to cataloguers and to readers.

11.2 As usual, of course, there are missteps, some fairly serious. To argue that a book on the killings of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics, if classed under Olympics, shows "gross insensitivity"(p. 170) and shows, rather, either a lack of grasp of citation-order rules or a proclivity to treat "Jewish" as the prepotent element in any string of concepts—racism, as is so often found amoung crusaders, in reverse.

11.3 There is the lack of awareness, usual among American librarians, of any solution not within the narrow horizons of the DDC/LCC alternative. He quotes Freedman with apparent approval: "The long Dewey number is error prone for the classifier, processor, shelver, and reader....Requiring [the reference librarian] to do floor work, "schlepping" around ten-digit numbers, seems unreasonable."(p. 183) The point is well taken, but both LCC and UDC (for entirely different reasons, of course) offer reasonable solutions to this problem, but the latter is never argued for (though it seems to me to form as reasonable an "alternative" as much of what Berman does espouse).

11.4 Though Berman in general opposes the idea of "phoenix" schedules, he gives an example that leans the other way: "HCL in late 1973 reactivated 301.413 (formerly denoting 'Celibacy')" to "cover sociologically oriented material on Transvestism and Transvestites."(p. 185) But such an action well demonstrates the fallacy of the literary-warrant attitude that the schedule should provide only codes for those concepts represented by the publications of one "moment" in historical time. Having thus canceled the appropriate class for the "outworn" idea of celibacy in favor of the "with-it" (the "New Left" is nothing if not "with-it") idea of transvestism, what is Hennepin County Library going to do with the 1980 imprint *The New Celibacy*?

11.5 Whatever his quibbles be with DDC_{19}, or his feelings against classification based on disciplines rather than on objects/concepts, it is scarcely an improvement to have (as Hennepin County Library) a single class-code for "Governesses/wet nurses/nannies,"(p. 181) three concepts related all to the same object/concept, but each from the point of view of a distinct discipline or subdiscipline.

11.6 And, finally, his attitude toward the revision process bears out not only his lack of a rounded theory behind all his ideas, but an actual hostility toward those whose function should be (though, I grant, all too often not successful in the attempt) to provide such a theory—teachers of cataloguing/classification. Berman argues that the DDC board should be made up of users, and should specifically "exclude...library school faculty,"(p. 182) as if they are all ivory-tower blatherers who are *de facto* unable to see users' needs—a characterization which would, wherever true, invalidate (for me) that teacher's credibility as a theorist. To be a theorist is not just to generalize; it is to see practical problems (whether in one's own experience, in the reported experience of others, or by speculation) and to attempt to provide practical solutions to them by analysis of those very problems in terms of their constitutive principles and elements.

12 The Style of the Book

Much of the volume reads well, in a smooth flow and a conversational tone. Occasional over-striving for informality results in lack of conceptual clarity when complex issues are being dealt with. The index is particularly helpful in that it even refers to examples used/discussed in the text

12.1 But the constant attempt at sly humor is not as acceptable. Berman says that "librarianship has yet to produce an Art Buchwald"(p. 190)—and he is absolutely right, despite the almost audible (though unverbalized) followup, "But I'd be willing to stand as a candidate." One of the papers is ostensibly in verse form,(pp. 90-94) but would lose nothing except its atmosphere of arrogant preciosity were it to be printed in ordinary paragraphs. Berman occasionally dons one particular vice of the sportswriter when he strains to find a succession of synonyms such as "descriptors" and "rubrics" (for plain old "subject headings"),(p. 87) and mimics (as ineffectively as it is surprising) Norman Mailer in his frequent references to himself as "the head cataloger."(p. 169 *et passim*) And it must have been a typo that substituted "Juvenalia" for "Juvenilia"[15](p. 157)—unless Berman sees himself not merely as the bibliothecal Buchwald but as the successor to the Latin satirist. Indeed, it could seem as if he has read and applied to himself such a characterization of Juvenal as is found in *Cas-*

sell's Encyclopaedia of World Literature (rev. ed.): "With a burning intensity of moral zeal, Juvenal uses his powers of bitter invective to attack, though carefully avoiding references to living persons, the vices and follies of his day."[16]

12.2 But it is in his use of condescension as humor that Berman is most irritating (and it is here too that he most clearly shows the unwholesome polemical attitude that fuels his efforts). To refer to someone's acceptance of an overdue change in LCSH as showing "infantile gusto"(p. 88) is more than an *argumentum ad hominem*; but when he writes a two-page spoof ("Megasucrose Levels and Manual Bibliographic Searching"[pp. 201-02]) of Gorman's defense of ISBD(M) that focuses on the candy bars as central methodological elements, what comes to mind goes beyond "scurrilous" to "vapid"! The low point/nadir/limit has not been reached, however, till we encounter his two-pager on synonyms for **Buttocks** ("Bringing Up the Rear,"[pp. 84-85]) in which he refers to LC's rather prim *x* Derriere and *x* Gluteal region as "gutsy, uncompromising professionalism." That he is able to refer to his own effort in the same spirit ("for shredding") does not, I think, excuse it.

13 Epilogue

Still, however inappropriate the style on occasion, however polemical and self-blinding the motivation on occasion, and however lacking in a broad and theoretical view of what is needed and can be attempted, the purpose is serious and the problems are real. What a pity that Berman had not prepared himself more adequately for these efforts, and has not delivered himself of his opinions not only with passion but with that humble seriousness which will be needed to persuade the bibliothecal world to help solve it all—because partial and local solutions are just not good enough anymore (if they ever were)!

13.1 But it is a start, a beginning salutary in that very passion. Let us not ignore it, let us not be distracted from its purpose by the narrowness of vision shown in so many of his solutions, nor by the feebleness and poor taste of so much of his humor:

—books *are* for use;
—saving the time of the reader is worth all the cost and effort,

and all the rest. To be a librarian must cease to be merely a follower of the accepted, whether what is accepted be new or old, glamorous and sophisticated, or familiar and unquestioned. It is to make happen, in the provision of documentary relevance, what needs to happen.

13.2 And concern, for all his faults, is what animates Berman.

REFERENCES

1. In the cataloguing of a real periodical he gives two subject headings: **1. Cooperatives—Minnesota—Periodicals** and **2. Radicalism—Periodicals**,(p. 31) with no reason given for the lack of a place element in the second. Is this too an exemplification of Berman's unexpressed feelings that the locus is too obvious to mention if it be that of the library doing the cataloguing? If so, why give a place element in the first heading?

2. A general principle of subject cataloguing that admits of practically no exception is that a coterminous class code or subject heading serves the purposes of both the searcher for the general and the special, while a more general heading can only focus upon part of the contents of the document, thus in principle rendering it unlikely to be found by the searcher at the document's own level. Another way to state the same principle is that it is better to provide for more retrievals than fewer, and thus wiser to specify coterminously, as long as elements of the concrete heading (class code, subject heading) are linked with their abstract generalizations by *see also* references, etc.

3. It is unfortunate, I grant, that librarians have not settled upon a "sayable" way to format such headings in the order of the conceptual prepotence of their elements, but the point is that such conceptual prepotence is supreme, even when it conflicts with the self-proclaimed (but intuitively nonuseful) natural order.

4. How indeed can it be reformulated so as to preserve context without being leading?—"Does this book have a subtitle?" But this again cannot fail to elicit a reasonable answer if the entry itself is intelligible. Even Berman would not claim that catalogue users care that much about semicolons.

5. Cf. lecture V, "The Structure of Bibliographic Entries," in my book *The Idea of Order in Bibliography*. (Bangalore: Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science, 1978), for a full enunciation of the cruciality of the principle of subfile searchability.

6. Langridge, Derek W. *Classification and Indexing in the Humanities*. London: Butterworths, 1976, p. 68.

7. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, 1965, s.v. "bushmen."

8. Ibid., s.v. "Sioux." ("Sioux" is derived from the Chippewa term translated literally as "little snake, enemy"—surely more offensive than "inhabitants of the bush."

9. Perreault, J.M. "Latest vs. Contemporaneous Place Names in Library of Congress Subject Headings." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* i(1981):37-38, section 7.

10. He argues that, in regard to LC's reference structure connected to the heading for anarchism: "The total *holdings* on 'anarchism' no more dictate its assiciation with 'Terrorism' than those on 'Socialism' demand a cross-reference to 'Sabotage.'"(p. 67) But this is precisely to misunderstand the relation between the headings that is manifested in the LCSH reference **Anarchism and anarchists** *sa* **Terrorism**, which means only that the *concept* "anarchism" is specified (*not* defined, as Berman seems to imagine) by the *concept* "terrorism"; i.e., that terrorism is one of the types of anarchism, or a way of contributing to the dissolution of the establishment (this last, "dissolution of the establishment," could be taken as a definition of an-archy, dis-order). To mention the library's holdings is absolutely irrelevant to the concept-analytic question: What are the kinds/means/attitudes by which the generic concept *anarchism* can be identified?

11. Cf. my paper "The Concept 'Main Class' and its Implication for Structural Improvement of UDC." In *Proceedings of the International Symposium "UDC in Relation to Other Indexing Languages,"* HercegNovi, Yugoslavia, 1971—note that notational simplicity is not necessary, in my definition, to the recognition of main-class status.

12. I emphatically do not agree that such generic posting is wise or even useful—far better to give a *see also* from **Composers, German** (without the subdivision—**Biography**) to the particular name; but I give it thus in the text as conforming to Berman's practice in the Schickele case and elsewhere in his book.

13. Berman seems quite unaware that his concern here is for a work enshrining an unfortunate canard about Loew, one which might well be offensive to a historically knowledgeable Jew: "This legend has no historical basis in the life of Loew or [even] in the era close to his lifetime." (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 7, col. 755); "the unfounded and atypical legend that he was the creator of the famous Prague *golem* (he seems not to have dealt with magic)...." (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 10, col. 379); Loew is characterized (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol.10, col. 374) as "rabbi, talmudist, moralist, and mathematician."

14. Berman quotes Freedman with approval to the effect that there is no interest in this aspect of classification in the United States, as against the considerable British interest—in apparent ignorance of the important work of such Americans as Freeman, Atherton and Caless.

15. Not for works created in his youth but for the cataloguing of books for children—in itself a failed attempt at humor, a sort of pun.

16. *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of World Literature*, rev. ed, 1973, s.v. "Juvenal."

SANFORD BERMAN: RESPONSE

Pedantic jargon. Baseless accusations. Inept analogies. Lordly conceits. Gross misinterpretations. Erroneous attributions. Undone homework. And assorted bigotries. To adequately respond to such a pseudo-scholarly "hatchet job" would require another whole *Occasional Paper*, so let these several points suffice.

1 *"Collection of ephemerata."* On what rational basis can anyone so characterize a 249-page volume that includes substantial, previously-unpublished papers on AACR2 implementation(pp. 18-25) and Judaica subject cataloguing(pp. 113-23), the latter now being serialized in the *Jewish Librarians Caucus Newsletter* (for the initial installment, see vol. 6, no. 2, April/June 1982, pp. 3-4); a first-ever treatment of "alternative materials"(pp. 124-48) that has since, with revisions, been reprinted in James P. Danky and Elliott Shore's *Alternative Materials in Libraries* (Scarecrow Press, 1982), pp. 31-66; a Dewey-critique selected for republication in Bill Katz's *Library Lit. 11-the Best of 1980* (Scarecrow Press, 1981), pp. 99-107; a *Sex Index* model that, in Eric Moon's opinion, "may convert many to the fun and science of indexing" (*Library Journal*, July 1980, p. 1492); and over 20 items derived from the *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, which itself won the H.W. Wilson Library Periodical Award in 1976?

1.2 *Ranganathan.* It is claimed that a passage on p. 94 "alludes...to Ranganathan's 'every reader his/her book.'" It does not. If the expressed sentiment parallels the guru's, it does so unintentionally.

2 *JEWISH-AMERICAN LITERATURE/CATHOLIC-AMERICAN LITERATURE/MINORITY-AMERICAN LITERATURE.* The *Joy* proposed substitute heading, JEWISH-AMERICAN LITERATURE, precisely "systematizes" with other such *ethnic* literature rubrics as AFRO-AMERICAN LITERATURE, CHICANO LITERATURE, and SCANDINAVIAN-AMERICAN LITERATURE, all used at Hennepin County Library (HCL) (see, for instance, Hennepin County Library, *Catalog* [10th ed., 1982]: vol. 1, pp. 111-12; vol. 3, p. 1619; vol. 12, p. 8233). Since Catholics qualify as a religious rather than ethnic group, the hyphenated form obviously doesn't apply. And nearly everyone knows that there's simply no "warrant" for a descriptor like **Minority-American Literature**. Instead, HCL employs **Minority Literature**, noting on the authority file that this form—given the collection's nature—is "not subdivided by **—United States,**" and making appropriate "see also" references to the more specific varieties of American ethnic literature located elsewhere in the catalogue:

Minority Literature. See also Afro-American literature; Asian-American literature; Chicano literature; Jewish-American literature; Native American literature; Scandinavian-American literature.

2.1 *"Cataloging...a real periodical"* (from Perreault's reference 1). To assign **Cooperatives—Minnesota—Periodicals** and **Radicalism—Periodicals** to the same title indicates that the journal deals with the topic of cooperatives only in Minnesota, but treats radicalism in a more general, nonlocal fashion. Maxim: It's dangerous to evaluate how a particular work has been catalogued without examining the work itself.

2.3 *—Juvenile Literature, etc.* The purpose in dropping **—Juvenile Literature** is to achieve age-integrated catalogues, a practice which accords with a growing trend to physically integrate adult and juvenile collections. Subheadings like —ADDRESSES, ESSAYS, LECTURES, ETC. and —DOCTRINAL AND CONTROVERSIAL WORKS merely create artificial sub-files, separating material that in fact is essentially similar. Further, in the explicit context of public/school/community college libraries, subdivisions like —AMATEURS' MANUALS and —POPULAR WORKS are disturbingly redundant, again illogically and unnecessarily splitting what ought to be whole files. Hard as it may be to comprehend for someone who seemingly enjoys little firsthand experience in nonresearch institutions, a typical American school or public library not only doesn't stock material on federal aid to libraries in India *today*, but almost certainly won't do so *tomorrow* either. However, even if it did add such extra-U.S. material, the "more work" engendered to retrospectively expand existing headings would be relatively trivial, or—alternatively—"FEDERAL AID TO LIBRARIES—INDIA" might be assigned to the new work, while allowing the unsubdivided form to continue to represent U.S.-oriented material. In any event, to compare a limited subhead policy with the point made concerning collation details (and further classing implications) for various audiovisual formats is to commit the classic "apples and oranges" fallacy.

2.4 *Hierarchical filing.* Of course some element of hierarchy—e.g., for dates—necessarily obtains in any catalogue. Hierarchy, however, becomes dysfunctional when there's no sensible, immediately perceived reason or necessity for the separation, the ranking, as in this actual LCSH sequence:

PREGNANCY
PREGNANCY—DURATION
PREGNANCY—NUTRITIONAL ASPECTS
PREGNANCY—PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS
PREGNANCY—TRIMESTER, FIRST

PREGNANCY, ABDOMINAL
PREGNANCY, COMPLICATIONS OF
PREGNANCY, ECTOPIC
PREGNANCY, MULTIPLE
PREGNANCY, PROTRACTED
PREGNANCY, UNWANTED
PREGNANCY IN MIDDLE AGE

Whenever possible, strict alphabetical order—at once predictable and familiar—seems preferable to contrived hierarchies. And alphabetical order would reduce to a non sequitur the imagined filing "conflict" between ART THERAPY and ART—THERAPEUTIC.

2.5 *Added entries for initialisms and acronyms.* The "treatment" accorded "YAAN" and "Y.A.A.N." is not "extended to WLB" because: (1) the added second entry is for the initialism: WLB (though shown without intervening periods), and (2) "WLB," not being a true, pronouncable acronym like "YAAN," does not require the extra "treatment."

2.6 *Added-title entries.* (1) "Why are there only two extra tracings of the title *Raise race rays raze*, not three...?" There *are* three:

II. Title: Race rays raze raise.
III. Title: Rays race raze raise.
IV. Title: Raze race rays raise.

(2) "Mahagony" is not suggested as an additional added-title entry because the variant spelling occurs practically at the end of the word and in most catalogues would not affect the search. (3) Counterposing arguments about "intelligibility" and "memorability"—e.g., regarding an added title entry for *Shelanu, an Israel Journal*—serves no useful end. In such cases, it may be reasonably assumed that the "intelligible" is also memorable. (4) For more on the theory of added-title entries and its actual application, see "Title Access: The Need, the Policy, and the Practice." *Technicalities* 1(Dec. 1980):6-7, later updated by "Missing Titles." *Technicalities* 2(March 1982):11.

3 *Title tracings.* Even with collections by single authors, the operative, commonsense rule must be to trace what may be sought. Novellas and full-length plays would fit that rule, as well as individual stories or essays that (1) might provide a kind of subject access short of innovating and assigning a subject heading; (2) are known to be widely-discussed and cited; or (3) have been adapted into other genres, for instance becoming the basis for a film or television program.

3.1 *Abbreviations.* (1) The ridiculed "opposition to various abbreviations" springs directly from empirical research conducted among Wisconsin students in 1973 and at Hennepin County Library in 1979. The sources are explicitly cited on pages 23 and 25. The Hennepin survey, incidentally, employed an in-context instrument. For the full report and reproduced catalogue entry-examples containing abbreviations, see Larry Legus, "Sure, They Save Space, but Who Knows What They Mean?" *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, no. 40, May/June 1979, pp. 24-29. (2) People who don't know what *c* means equally won't know what *c* with a circle around it means. And if such information is worth including in catalogue entries at all, it might as well be understandable. (3) HCL has systematically replaced *ca.*—as in "Jonson, Ben, ca. 1573-1637" and "Tourneur, Cyril, ca. 1575-1626"—with the generally-comprehended question mark: e.g., "Jonson, Ben, 1573?-1637" and "Tourneur, Cyril, 1575?-1626." The result is surely more intelligible.

4 *"Carping about AACR2 and ISBD(M)."* See the above comments relating to "abbreviations." To repeat, with emphasis: the Hennepin test asked both staff and patrons to state, in their own words, what a particular entry/element—e.g., HIGHLIGHTED IN CONTEXT—meant. The study demonstrated two things, at least: (1) it is possible to research user comprehension in a genuinely objective way (i.e., to construct an instrument that doesn't itself prejudice the outcome), and (2) many of the profession's taken-for-granted conventions—like *"c," "v.," "b.,"* and *"d.,"*—don't make much (if any) sense to average library-goers.

4.2 *"R. R. Bowker" v. "Bowker (R. R.) Company."* The HCL decision to favor surname-like corporate name forms did not emanate from any worry over "filing problems." No such assertion appears anywhere in the book-text.

4.3 *"Lawrence, D. H.," etc.* Yes, following standard procedure, HCL records variant name forms, including fuller names, in its authority file. That is, after all, largely what authority files are for.

4.4 *Torah.* Why not make a *see*-reference from "Torah" to "Bible. O.T."? For the elemental reason that "Torah" particularly denotes the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Bible, not the entire Old Testament. Accordingly, the HCL catalogue contains this cross-reference:

Torah. *See* Bible. O.T. Pentateuch.

4.5 *"Is there really any football fan who would not know that 'Vikes' derives from 'Vikings'?"/"Who but a fan would use such slang-names?"*

First, in their home state, the "Minnesota Vikings" are unquestionably best known as "The Vikes." Second, to know that "Vikes" is short for "Vikings" is not automatically to know how or where the team name appears in a library catalogue. And third, who *isn't* a Vikes' fan in Minnesota?

4.6 *"Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, Shah."* (1) These cross-references appear in the HCL authority file:

> Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, Shah of Iran, 1919-1980.
>
> sf Muhammad Riza Pahlavi, Shah of Iran, 1919-1980
> Pahlavi, Mohammed Reza, Shah of Iran, 1919-1980
> Reza Pahlavi, Mohammed, Shah of Iran, 1919-1980
> Riza Pahlavi, Mohammed, Shah of Iran, 1919-1980
> Shah Muhammad Reza Pahlavi, 1919-1980
> Shah of Iran (Mohammed Reza Pahlavi), 1919-1980

(2) Why not "generalize the technique" of making rank-word cross-references if they promote searching success? (However, even if not totally generalized, a few such references may helpfully serve to "break the code," indicating to casual catalogue-users the basic entry pattern for rulers', politicians', and generals' names.)

4.6 *"Elaborate note about editors and previous titles...p. 33."* The only conceivable candidate is the *Wilson Library Bulletin* entry, which mentions one "previous title" and names one (the then current) editor. Anyone describing that relatively Spartan note as "elaborate" must suffer from acute hyperbolitis.

5.2 *"Eskimos"/"Bushmen"/"Finns," etc.* Well, there's simply no excuse for this medley of distortions and outright fantasies.

5.2 ENGLISH LANGUAGE—TEXTBOOKS FOR FOREIGNERS is assailed as both Anglocentric and printist. But an equally powerful reason for choosing ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE as a substitute is that educators and indexers actually employ that completely nonjudgmental term (for usage examples, etc., see *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*: nos. 14/15, 1 June 1975, pp. 35-36; nos. 18/19, 1 Dec. 1975, p. 38, no. 26, 1 Feb. 1977, p. 44; no. 47, July/Aug. 1980, p. 13; no. 50, Jan./Feb. 1981, p. 20; no. 52, May/June 1981, pp. 14-15; no. 53, July/Aug. 1981, p. 12; no 56, Jan./Feb. 1982, p. 10; and *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors*, 1982, p. 82).

5.5 Ethnic and other groups should be called by their own names, not by names applied to them by (frequently hostile) outsiders. This dictum stems not from anxiety about "offending" anyone, but rather from an elemental

commitment to intellectual honesty, scholarly accuracy and a respect for human diversity and integrity. It has been formally endorsed by both the ALA Subject Analysis Committee and the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division. That endorsement is mentioned three times—on pages 73, 81 and 101—the last reference including a verbatim quote from the relevant document, *Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People and Peoples*: "The authentic name of ethnic, national, religious, social or sexual groups should be established if such a name is determinable. If a group does not have an authentic name, the name preferred by the group should be established...."

5.2 To compare the modern personal name forms for "classical authors" (which may differ somewhat from the original Greek or Latin versions, but nonetheless honestly and directly represent the original names) with the recommended substitution, e.g., of "Inuit" (an authentic, self-preferred name) for "Eskimos" (an inauthentic, alien ethnonym) is to again commit that "apples and oranges" fallacy. No contradiction exists between preferring "Virgil" to "Vergilius Maro, Publius" (the former being merely an English translation or rendering of the original name) and insisting that "Inuit" be used instead of "Eskimos" (the latter *not* being merely an English or any other rendering of the correct original name). Christa F.B. Hoffmann raised this identical question about ethnonym equivalents seven years ago, asking: "Do you enter materials on Germans under Deutsche...Koreans under Hankwuk saiam...Chinese under Chung-kuo ..Latvians under Latvietis?...Talking with some of the nonnative U.S. citizens, of which I am one, we all thought that we would look under the English equivalent of our peoples name and not under Chung-kuo, Hankwuk Saiam, Latvietis or Deutsche" (*HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, nos. 14/15, 1 June 1975, p. 8). The editorial response then still holds:

> Ms. Hoffmann's remarks on *Deutsche, Chung-kuo*, etc. sadly miss the point. Yes, in an essentially English-language subject scheme, it's appropriate to include bona fide English equivalents for non-English terms (like nations and peoples)—*providing* they're correct, *unbiased* translations. Thus "Germans" and "Chinese" qualify, whereas "Krauts" and "Chinks" don't...(p. 9).

5.3 The central truth about "stunted representatives of humanity" is that the foreigners' term, BUSHMEN, early acquired such a derogatory connotation. Whether "Bushmen" sprang from Dutch or English usage is far less critical than the indisputable fact—not speculation—that it never represented that people's own name for itself. To quote once more from the 1 June 1975 *HCL Cataloging Bulletin:*

> No one, it appears, has ever claimed "Bushmen" to be a "bona fide English equivalent" for the *San's* own name (or, more precisely, the neighboring Khoi-Khoin's inoffensive appellation for them). On the contrary, it's palpably alien, chauvinist, and defamatory.(p. 9)

The extensive sources cited on p. 75 of *Joy* amply confirm that years-ago contention. And the Library of Congress has since recognized its validity by completely replacing BUSHMEN with SAN (AFRICAN PEOPLE), an action reported on page 62.

5.5 If it can be documented that "Finns" is an inappropriate ethnonym—i.e., not a true English equivalent of "Suomi"—it should be changed. For a detailed example of just such an ethnonym correction, see *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, nos. 6/7, 5 April 1974, where—on page 5—Rudy Johnson explained in a letter that the group commonly known as "Lapps" ought to be called by the legitimate English equivalent of their own name: Saame. Subsequent HCL findings and authority-reforms appear on pages 5-6, as well as in later issues: nos. 8/9/10, 1 Sept. 1974, p. 97; nos. 14/15, 1 June 1975, p. 49.

5.5 *"Anarchism and anarchists.* See also *Terrorism."* Anarchism is at once a well-developed philosophy or sociopolitical theory, and also an historic movement. To define it solely as "dissolution of the establishment" is foolishly simplistic and ahistorical, while equating it—through a "specifying" *see also* reference—with "terrorism" betrays (and continues) exactly the sort of malicious distortion perpetrated by mainstream media for nearly a century. (On the latter point, see Nhat Hong, *The Anarchist Beast: The Anti-Anarchist Crusade in Periodical Literature, 1884-1906.* Minneapolis: Soil of Liberty, 1980, and concerning "Terrorism" syndetics: *Prejudices and Antipathies*, 1971, pp. 135-39.)

5.5 *(End of Section) "Morphology."* When someone makes a perfectly sensible subject search under MIDDLE EAST and finds nothing at all, or, at best, a "see" reference to the still valid LC form, NEAR EAST, the problem is not one of "morphology," but of vocabulary.

6-6.5 *Cezanne and occultism.* Regardless of personal opinions about occult and paranormal topics, classing spirit writings, Castaneda and cosmobiology in the 130s purposely brings related materials together on the shelves, making them accessible to precisely those browsers most likely to want them. Further, in the specific case of "automatic writing," allowing the form to dictate classification violates no sacred canons. Indeed, it harmonizes with well-established practice, for a novel or drama about Cezanne would no more merit classification in "Art" or "Biography" than Robert's opus.

6.4 *Large Red Herrings.* When talking about classification, the argument should stick to classification. Thus, discussing the subject tracings associated with the Schickele work introduced a Large Red Herring. The essential truth, in a classification context, is that Schickele's musical spoof was recommended—in "Catalogue of Horrors"(p. 8)—for either 780.207 or 817.54 classing, the former denoting not "musical miscellany," but more particularly "humorous treatment of music," and the latter representing post-1945 American humor. At HCL the work would presently be classed only in the 817s inasmuch as public service staff have specifically requested that all humor titles be classified in the literary (800) range.

7-7.5 *Underdeveloped areas/Aged/"Christocentrism"/Homosexuals, etc.* (1) The "Third World" v. "Underdeveloped areas" controversy has been explored for some time and at some length. See, for instance, *HCL Cataloging Bulletin:* no. 5, 21 Jan. 1974, p. 21; nos. 6/7, 5 April 1974, pp. 40-41; nos. 8/9/10, 1 Sept. 1974, p. 7; nos. 18/19, 1 Dec. 1975, p. 40; nos. 23/24, 1 Sept. 1976, p. 38; no. 26, 1 Feb. 1977, p. 47; no. 45, March/April 1980, p. 29; no. 47, July/Aug. 1980, p. 36; no. 48, Sept./Oct. 1980, p. 32; no. 49, Nov./Dec. 1980, p. 47; no. 50, Jan./Feb. 1981, p. 59; no. 51, March/April 1981, p. 38; no. 52, May/June 1981, p.42; no. 54, Sept./Oct. 1981, p. 44; no. 57, March/April 1982, pp. 42-43; also: "More on Subject Heading Changes." *Africana Libraries Newsletter*, no. 4, Feb. 1976, p. 27; and "LCSH: An Exchange Between Mary Kay Pietris and Sandy Berman." *Technicalities* 1(March 1981):6. Apparently what needs restating is that "underdeveloped areas" as LC applies it (in social, geographical, economic, political, and other contexts) equals "Third World." The question then becomes: which is the better term? For reasons alike of equity and literary warrant (i.e., general familiarity) THIRD WORLD wins.

7 *SENIORS and AGED.* SENIORS beats AGED because it's the term demonstrably preferred by persons in that age category, as determined from group and publication names (see *Joy*, pp. 100-02, and "LCSH: An Exchange Between Mary Kay Pietris and Sandy Berman." *Technicalities* 1[March 1981]:6-7, 9), because persons over 60 just don't like "aged" (see *Joy*, p. 99, and *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, no. 20, 1 March 1976, p. 51), and because it has become widely used in the general press and elsewhere (see *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*: nos. 8/9/10, 1 Sept. 1974, p. 84; nos. 11/12/13 15 March 1975, p. 86; no. 17, 1 Oct. 1975, p. 38; nos. 18/19, 1 Dec 1975, p. 36; no. 26, 1 Feb. 1977, p. 46; no. 29, July/Aug. 1977, p. 22; no. 47, July/Aug. 1980, p. 30; no. 48, Sept./Oct. 1980, p. 27; no. 49, Nov./Dec. 1980, p. 42; no. 50, Jan./Feb. 1981, p. 53; no. 51, March/April 1981, p. 35; no. 52, May/June 1981, p. 31; no. 53, July/Aug. 1981, p. 32; no. 54, Sept./Oct. 1981, p. 38; no.

56, Jan./Feb. 1982, p. 29; no. 57, March/April 1982, p. 37; no. 58, May/June 1982, p. 35; no. 59, July/Aug. 1982, p. 36).

7 *"Going along with the prevalent Western [illegible] as of which Christianity is a part"(end of section).* This is tantamount to "going along" with antisemitism, racism, sexism, etc. More can (and should) be expected of persons who claim membership in a humane profession.

7.1 *Gay* v. *Homosexuals.* Anyone knowing the etymology of "Gay"—a word dating from the sixteenth century—would not make the simple-minded mistake of claiming it signifies "happy and interesting." But the paramount issue here is that the self-name principle—plus growing "literary warrant"—mandate the replacement of the term *Homosexuals* by *Gays* (for documentation, see *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*: no. 4, 21 Nov. 1973, pp. 3-4; no. 5, 21 Jan. 1974, pp. 3-4; nos. 8/9/10, 1 Sept. 1974, pp. 33-34; no. 30, Sept./Oct. 1977, p. 28; no. 32, Jan./Feb. 1978, pp. 5-6; no. 34, May/June 1978, p. 7; no. 46, May/June 1980, p. 10; no. 48, Sept./Oct. 1980, p. 13; no. 49, Nov./Dec. 1980, p. 20; no. 50, Jan./Feb. 1981, p. 24; no. 51, March/April 1981, p. 17; no. 52, May/June 1981, p. 18; no. 54, Sept./Oct. 1981, p. 17; no. 57, March/April 1982, p. 18; no. 58, May/June 1982, pp. 15-16; no. 59, July/Aug. 1982, p. 15).

7.3 *Race.* Having extensively examined the "race" question over ten years ago (*Prejudices and Antipathies*, pp. 90-95), it seems pointless and tiresome to rehash the matter now except to reemphasize that "race" is—unless explicitly qualified—a biological concept (and one now in almost total disrepute), while "ethnicity," however, comprehends many elements, biological heredity being only one.

7.3 *"When will we be required to change not just catalogue entries but even the title pages of books?–woe to the library still offending its readers with The Nigger of the Narcissus!"(end of section).* This is vituperative and gratuitous nonsense. Nowhere in the *Joy* text nor anywhere else in the author's considerable canon is there a single word, phrase or sentence to warrant the innuendo about censoring title pages. The outburst immediately follows a Herrenvolk justification for regarding non-Western peoples as "barbarians" and an undocumented defense of MAN as a valid, appropriate heading, even though such "subsuming" terms have been devastatingly criticized and workable substitutes proposed (see, for instance, Casey Miller and Kate Swift, *"Man* as a false generic," in their *Handbook of Nonsexist Writing*. Barnes & Noble Books, 1980, pp. 9-34; Joan K. Marshall, "Sexism and Language," in her *On Equal Terms: A Thesaurus for Nonsexist Indexing and Cataloging*. Neal-Schuman, 1977,

pp. 3-5; "Humans," *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, nos. 8/9/10, 1 Sept. 1974, p. 61; "Humans," ibid., nos. 11/12/13, 15 March 1975, p. 83; Carla Knutson Biermaier, "Twin City Catalogers and LC: 'an Unscientific Survey,'" ibid., no. 26, 1 Feb. 1977, p. 7; S. Berman, "Cataloging for Public Libraries," ibid., no. 29, July/Aug. 1977, p. 33; Honolulu County Committee on the Status of Women, *Women, Men, and the New Language*, 1981, pp. 2-3, 8; Ellen Morgan, "Sexism in Language." In *An Intelligent Woman's Guide to Dirty Words*, 1973, pp. vii-ix; Macmillan Publishing Co. School Division, "Sexism—Language Usage Guidelines," in its *Guidelines for Creating Positive Sexual and Racial Images in Educational Materials*, 1975, pp. 18-24; Casey Miller and Kate Swift, "Who Is Man?" in their *Words and Women*, Doubleday, 1976, pp. 19-38; Hennepin County Library, *Catalog*, 10th ed., 1982, vol. 7, pp. 4655-59).

7.4 *"Berman's totalitarian linguistic utopianism."* The 1981 Margaret Mann Citation, by contrast, mentions a:

> significant contribution to the improvement of subject access to library collections. By examining the "prejudices and antipathies" embedded in library catalogs, he has heightened our sensitivity to semantic injustices. In doing this he has added a new dimension of social awareness to technical processing.

7.5 *"How often (and under what circumstances) should change to avoid offense, etc. and to maximize first tries be made?"(end of section).* Whenever the opportunity arises. Building a functional and equitable vocabulary is central to subject cataloguing. As a corollary: When the two principles of "findability" and "fairness" collide—as they do in the Inuit/Eskimo case—fairness should prevail. The text fully addresses that situation on page 83 ("Easy Access vs. Authenticity").

8.1 *RETIREMENT, AGEISM, SENIOR POWER tracings.* The core issue here—though almost impossible to tell from the paraphrase—is twofold: (1) the timely creation of new headings, and (2) the judicious assignment of subject analytics to reveal (and make accessible) key, high-interest topics that may not (yet) be the subject of many whole works.

8.2 *Use of PRECIS, etc.* Because (1) most "new" systems—like PRECIS—would not mesh into existing files; (2) split files are anathema to maximum catalogue use; (3) proposed substitute schemes would still be no more effective than the people who apply them; and (4) there is an incalculable investment by all types of American libraries in existing schemes like LCSH, DDC and LCC; it would be frankly irresponsible to advocate their destruction, even though propounded "substitutes" might be "theoretically" purer and intellectually more appealing. Instead, the sane, conser-

vative and economic approach must necessarily be to make what we already have work better, and to introduce reforms at such a deliberate pace that understaffed and underfunded institutions can reasonably manage them.

9 *Subdivision by place.* There is no need to specify which headings may be subdivided by place when all may be. And that's the situation at HCL.

9.1 *HCL's entry and cross-referencing for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.* This has since been completely revamped (see *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, no. 50, Jan./Feb. 1981, pp. 44-45).

9.3 *JEWISH AUTHORS.* Establishing an omnibus, potentially interminable and indigestible "see also" roster under JEWISH AUTHORS—or any similar form—is plainly ridiculous. Dual entries work much more efficiently.

9.3 *Judah Low ben Bezaleel.* So the legend linking Rabbi Lev with the Golem "has no historical basis in the life of Loew"! So what? Isn't that often the case with legends? In any event, anyone familiar with Beverly Brodsky's exquisite picture book, *The Golem: A Jewish Legend* (Lippincott, 1976), knows that—whether "historical" or not—Rabbi Lev is treated with great sympathy and affection. And the terrible reality of life in sixteenth-century Prague's Jewish ghetto comes through movingly. (This "issue," however, revolves about the particular book's worth, not its cataloguing treatment, and so is irrelevant.)

9.4 *Feminism/Women's Movement.* Not a shred of evidence substantiates the claim that "feminism" in "current usage" equals "Women's Movement." The concepts are related, yet distinct (see, for instance, *HCL Cataloging Bulletin:* no. 50, Jan./Feb. 1981, p. 63; no. 52, May/June 1981, p. 46; no. 53, July/Aug. 1981, p. 40; and no. 54, Sept./Oct. 1981, pp. 47-48, as well as the differing entries under FEMINISM an WOMEN'S MOVEMENT in the Hennepin County Library *Catalog*, 10th ed., 1982, vol. 5, pp. 3329-31, and vol. 15, pp. 10504-05.)

9.5 *Unification Church.* It is not the cataloguer's task to examine a creed's theology and then decide whether its self-characterization is correct. If one of the proliferating new religious movements says it's Buddhist, or Neo-Pagan, or Christian, then it's Buddhist, or Neo-Pagan, or Christian. If there's some sort of credal calculus for determining truth in this area—i.e., an ecumenically-approved formula or gadget—it should have been cited, with full purchasing details. (Ninian Smart, who—in December 1980—

appeared as an expert witness "in the High Court in London on the question of whether the Unification Church can be said to be Christian or not," regards the Church as "descriptively Christian." See his unpublished, 11-page paper, *The Moonies: Are They Christian?*, presented at a conference on "Conversion, Coercion, and Commitment in New Religious Movements," held June 11-14, 1981, in Berkeley, California, under auspices of the Center For The Study of New Religious Movements.)

10 *Fictional character headings.* HCL routinely constructs "personal" subject headings for fictional characters, treating such figures as if they were "real." This has been done for more than eight years, and there is no evidence whatever that catalogue-users have been misled by entries like PADDINGTON-THE-BEAR—FICTION; MARPLE, MISS JANE—FICTION; TARZAN—FICTION; or BACH, P.D.Q., 1807-1742?—FICTION into believing that these names denote now- or once-living creatures. Beyond that, the HCL authority file contains explicit "cataloger's notes" like that shown under "Kauffman, Max" (*Joy*, p. 215):

> cn Fictional character. Creator: Thomas Chastain.

And such headings as HOLMES, SHERLOCK, BORN 1854 (FICTIONAL CHARACTER) are employed to differentiate the works in which a character appears from works that interpret and discuss the character. (For more background and examples, see "Reference, Readers and Fiction: New Approaches." *Reference Librarian*, nos. 1/2. Fall/Winter 1981, pp. 45-53, later updated in *Technicalities* 2[July 1982]:7-16.) The actual catalog treatment of a single character is perhaps best exemplified by HCL's Holmesiana: see Hennepin County Library, *Catalog*, 10th ed., 1982, vol. 7, pp. 4477-79.

10.2 *"He suggests subject headings for children's fiction, e.g., Peaceableness for* Ferdinand the Bull. *He does not...counsel such headings for adult fiction as well, nor does he show awareness of the extraordinary difficulty of such an undertaking...."* Absolute rubbish! The *Ferdinand* proposition clearly appears within the context of a statement on discernible but LC-unvalidated themes common in children's literature. (*Joy*, p. 93) PEACEABLENESS resurfaces on p. 165, included among scores of "HCL subject headings for (mostly) children's media." Mostly. Not "only." That's simply because there are headings like "Bullying and bullies" and "First day in school" and "Bedtime" and "Silliness" and "Whispering" and "Peaceableness" more often appear in juvenile than adult literature. Nothing in the *Joy* text implies that a heading used typically for children's material could not be used for adult works. And, indeed, they are. MOVING TO A NEW NEIGHBORHOOD, for instance, has been assigned to Barbara

Friedrich's *Did Somebody Pack the Baby?* (Prentice-Hall, 1978), TALL TALES to James Frank Dobie's *Tales of Old-Time Texas* (Little, 1955), and the 1924 Will Rogers's film, *A Truthful Liar* (Blackhawk/Eastin-Phelan), MAKING FRIENDS to Harold H. Dawley's *Friendship: How to Make and Keep Friends* (Prentice-Hall, 1980), and Arthur C. Wassmer's *Making Contact* (Dial Press, 1978), and SENSITIVITY (PERSONAL QUALITY) to Diane O'Connor's *How to Make Your Man More Sensitive* (Dutton, 1975). Just how "extraordinarily difficult" is "such an undertaking"? Since HCL—and many other libraries—have been doing it for years, it shouldn't be hard to find out. But, as usual, persons who haven't done a thing talk most profoundly about how tough it is to do. (For more on the value of subject access to children's literature, especially fiction, and a report on how it's been done in Ontario school libraries, see Brian Burnham and Audrey Taylor, *PRECIS Indexing: Development of a Working Model for a School Library Cataloguing/Information Retrieval Network* [Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1982], p. 32-6.)

10.3 *"Labeling."* Many subject headings do, of course, function as "labels," ordinarily representing literary or media genres (e.g., SCIENCE FICTION and SCIENCE FICTION FILMS). However, "labeling"—from an intellectual freedom standpoint—becomes crucially different from assigning the nonjudgmental genre-heading, SCIENCE FICTION, to a Heinlein novel. The act or concept, in library discourse, relates exclusively to negative, cautionary "labeling" intended, like the skull and crossbones on poison, to warn potential users of works harmful or pernicious in content. Applying the negatively-charged rubric, LITERATURE, IMMORAL, or SEXIST FICTION to that Heinlein novel would thus qualify as censorial labeling, whereas assigning SCIENCE FICTION would not.

10.4 *DECENTRALIZATION/DECENTRALIZATION IN GOVERNMENT.* The "alternative" handling of Seldman's *Common Sense Radicalism* involves not a change in subject heading form (i.e., transmuting the highly specific DECENTRALIZATION IN GOVERNMENT into the broader DECENTRALIZATION), but rather a change in subject heading assignment. As it happens, the work in question deals with decentralization—the "small is beautiful" principle—in many spheres, including industry, energy and government. Hence, the assignment of a general descriptor instead of the much too narrow "government"form. That same, briefer heading has lately been applied at HCL to Hazel Henderson's *Politics of the Solar Age: Alternatives to Economics* (Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1981). It should be noted that a title like Seldman's or Henderson's does necessitate some vocabulary engineering inasmuch as

the LC thesaurus still hasn't incorporated the simpler term, DECENTRALIZATION. It must, therefore, be locally-innovated. (The longer rubric, DECENTRALIZATION IN GOVERNMENT, has thus far been used five times at HCL, being properly and specifically applied for instance, to Peter L. Berger's *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy* [American Enterprise Institute, 1977], and Minnesota Public Radio's *Small Government Units* [1976 tape]).

10.5 *ENDOWMENTS/FOUNDATIONS, etc.* Naturally, if introducing "foundations" or "records" or "tapes" (as substitutes for "endowments," "phonorecords," and "phonotapes") results in a "conflict" or "ambiguity," the heading should be modified: e.g., at HCL, the simple "phonorecord" subsititute would have directly conflicted with the established form, RECORDS (denoting private, personal documents) and so became RECORDS, PHONOGRAPH. In another library, the modifier might not be necessary. And FOUNDATIONS in most catalogues will "conflict" with no other existing form. Indeed, there's ample precedent for the one word descriptor—e.g., *Legislative Indexing Vocabulary* (1980), p. 218; *Words That Mean Business* (1981), p. 75; *Population/Family Planning Thesaurus* (1978), p. 88.

10.6 *"The Lady Who Loved Horses."* A glib "critic" who has not bestirred himself sufficiently to actually inspect the work he chooses to declaim about will inevitably make fatuous, error-ridden pronouncements. This is another example. The indexed graphic has nothing to do with "bestiality." The indexer knew it. The "critic" didn't. And, worse, didn't bother to inform himself. (In the next edition, incidentally, "zoophilia" will replace "bestiality" as the preferred descriptor. As authority, see Anne Mandetta and Patricia Gustaveson, *Abortion to Zoophilia*, Carolina Population Center, 1976, p. 56.)

11.2 *Blood of Israel.* A closer reading of the text would disclose that Judith Schaeffer and Suan J. Alessi, not the *Joy* author, objected to LC's classification in the Fall 1975 *Unabashed Librarian*. But no matter what the provenance, the complaint remains valid. The classification should reflect the central theme or focus of a work. In this case, did the book deal mainly with sports and only secondarily with terrorism and murder? Or was it the other way around? The DCD chief, as reported, concurred that LC's classifier had erred, probably because of working from too-meagre CIP data.

11.4 *The New Celibacy.* Anyone simply inquiring by phone or mail, or consulting HCL's catalogue, would learn that Gabrielle Brown's *New Celibacy* (Mcgraw-Hill, 1980) had been classed in 301.41578, the notation for "other variant sexual relations."

11.6 *DDC governance*. Library school "theorists" may function as consultants to the DDC board, but—on the basis of their previous, utterly disastrous meddling—should definitely not be accorded decision-making authority.

12-12.2 *Style*. Opinions on style, depending heavily on personal taste, are neither easily nor profitably debated. Simply for the record, then, here are citations to some contrary, yet wholly representative, comments from published *Joy* reviews:

> The book is quite readable besides being impassioned. Berman has a good sense of humor, not a quality always found in reformers—(Grant Burns. *New Pages* 2[Spring 1982]:17.)
>
> The idea that cataloguing is boring, unimaginative, and primarily clerical is widespread in librarianship. Those of us who think bibliographic control and the organization of information is exciting and creative have often felt like voices in the wilderness. We therefore welcome...*The Joy of Cataloging* with appreciation and delight—(Anita Garey, *WLW Journal*, April/Sept. 1981, pp. 14-15).
>
> The articles, in addition to being provocative, are readable and entertaining. This is a book for everyone concerned with creating catalogues for school and public libraries and for all those who try daily to interpret cataloguing hieroglyphics to the young (and not so young)—(Susan Traill, *Emergency Librarian* 9[Sept./Oct. 1981]:19-20).
>
> It's a sharp and tingling brew....enlightening, well-documented, even funny....Berman's spoof of library research literature, "Megasucrose levels and Manual Bibliographic Searching," is a delight for anyone who has fallen asleep over one of those papers in *Library Resources and Technical Services*—(Noel Peattie, *Sipapu* 12[1981]012-13).
>
> *Joy of Cataloging* is a very readable book written by one who delights, delightfully, in knocking down every sacred cow the cataloguing fraternity sets up—(Frank Bright, *Added Entries*, no. 173, 5 June 1981, pp. 5-6).
>
> No matter what cataloging beliefs one may hold, it cannot be denied that Berman makes a powerful statement. Writing with an acid pen, he proposes that cataloguing adhere to three basic principles: intelligibility, findability, and fairness....The book may be upsetting to other cataloguers, but public service librarians will love it—(Sophie K. Black, *Booklist*, 15 Oct. 1981, p. 283).

1.2 *Ranganathan.* If this almost-quotation is not an allusion to Ranganathan, it is evidence either of plagiarism or of unconscionable ignorance in anyone claiming to be a reformer of cataloguing/classification. Berman's words are: It's *no* service to our patrons/if/*their* books,/*their* records,/ &/*their* films/get magnificently/and/irretrievably buried./ In/the/ catalogue. Well, maybe it's not that much of an allision to Ranganathan; but it surely is the cause of teeth grinding to any reader who loves the poems of e.e. cummings.

2 *JEWISH.* That such headings as **Afro-American Literature** are used is not what is being criticized, but that they are not mentioned as being used in that form. (The same sort of argument justifies the description of the book as consiting of "ephemerata"—things written not for the profession as a whole and argued out with counter examples if necessary, but things written for one's institutional colleagues and/or subordinates, thus calling upon unarticulated local assumptions and referring to sources of information not available to the reader in Alabama or Oregon.)

2.1 *"Cataloguing...."* Maxim: as in any good cookbook, anomalies are to be explicitly mentioned.

2.3 *—JUVENILE LITERATURE.* Physical integration of types and forms of materials is to be applauded, but is of no concern when we are discussing subject-heading subdivisions in the catalogue. (It is a cardinal principle of indexing that the index entries are to be arranged by a different principle or in a different order than that which they index—otherwise there is no purpose to the two arrangements as retrieval devices.)

2.3 *—JUVENILE (third sentence).* No such thing is apparent to anyone who realizes that distinctions can always be overridden (one of the purposes of reference service) but cannot be detected (at least in many cases) unless made during the cataloguing process. To say that—**Addresses, essays, lectures** is appropriate to this book is to say that it is not a treatise, or that (if, say, about Faulkner) will very likely consist of treatments of discrete problems or bodies of text. To say that—**Doctrinal and controversial works** is appropriate to a book is to say that it is neither historical nor blandly descriptive—and it is especially useful as the "facet indicator" linking-on—**Protestant authors**, etc.

2.3 *—AMATEURS'.* They would be "ludicrously redundant" only if there were no other sorts of treatments of the same subjects at HCL. Does Berman mean to say that HCL does consist of nothing but such stuff?

2.4 *PREGNANCY*. There is a real problem with phrase-headings of this sort, but it is not solved by simply cutting the Gordian knot—strict alphabetical order (word-by-word but not field-by-field or type-by-type) is OK if the querist knows the words used (even if used in a different order, since reference can be made), but not when the querist has only a (foggy, the usual sort of) conceptual grasp of what is needed.

2.5 *Added entries for initialisms and acronyms*. I admit misinterpreting WLB as an acronym, whereas at HCL it is interpreted as an initialism. But why does HCL seem then to have two ways of making an initialism such as Y.A.A.N. and YAAN? Or is WLB (and by logical implication YAAN) not, after all, an initialism but really an acronym?

2.6 *Added-title entries. Point (1)*. Sorry. My mistake.

2.6 *Point (3)*. Yes, it does serve a useful end. The establishment of a principle for the cataloguer to follow so as to be able to decide for him/herself rather than having to write Mr. Berman about it.

3 *Title tracings. "trace what may be sought."* Now there's a principle for you! How pray tell, is that magic criterion to be espied? But Berman's discussion, even if granted to be true at all points, misses my point: How does he decide whether to use title tracing as against author/title tracing?

3.1 *Abbreviations (item 2)*. To say that those who don't know what "c1975" means also don't know what "©1975" means is wholly gratuitous; well do I remember knowing (from general scholarly experience) that "©" meant "copyright", but knowing no such thing about the naked "c" when I first encountered it in library practice.

3.1 *Abbreviations (item 3)*. That sounds quite OK, and not outlandishly expensive.

4 *"Carping"....at end of his paragraph*. It is probably true that, out of the context of the catalogue-entry, "b." means literally nothing but "a letter of the alphabet, or an abbreviation of some word beginning 'b'". But what native English-speaker could miss on "Smith, John, b.1502"? The date makes it quite clear that here, as in most reference books, the person is being specified by date of birth and/or death—and that "b." evidently means not "died" but " [was] born."

4.2 *R.R. Bowker*. But the point of Berman's original discussion is "where to look," which surely involves us in a filing problem as soon as the form of entry has been decided (either the entry or the reference to it will begin with the initials).

4.3 *"Lawrence...."* Here Berman and I seem to have no disagreement. Why, then, is he still on the defensive ("That is, after all, largely what authority files are for.")? Why does he not simply agree with me where it could be appropriate (as I do with hir[illegible] many occasions)?

4.4 *Torah. Encyclopedia Judaica* 15, [illegible]5; "The term [Torah] is, however, also used loosely to designate the Bi[illegible] [=OT] as a whole."

4.5 *"Is there really...."*. I asked "Wh[illegible]a fan?"; if that is everybody in Hennepin County, OK.

4.6 *"Mohammed.* Thanks for telling us that you *do* do as I suggested; but does that answer my objection to other things that you do that are less reasonable?

4.6 *"Why not...?"(sentence two)* The problem with the question "Why *not*...?" is that to do so for Amir implies doing it for every general; and who is there likely to look for Eisenhower under "General"? Better would be to give (if anything) a general reference (without example, lest some unwary querist imagine that the example be the only instantiation) of the same sort as is used for initial particles such as "de" and "von".

4.6 *"Elaborate note...."* I must agree that the "elaborate note" about editors applying to *WLB* is not all that egregiously elaborate in regard to editors as such:

> Continues Wilson bulletin with volume 13, number 11 (1939).
> Issued Sept. 1943-June 1956 in two sections.
> Editor: W.R. Eshelman.

—but it is fairly elaborate as a whole. But the point is that those libraries which use LC printed cards often leave much information in their catalogues not relevant to what they hold. This is not a big error; but sometimes one sees that irrelevant headings have been traced on the basis of such irrelevant information. I would suppose that this is a practice that Berman would oppose, and therefore my question is: Since Milo Nelson became editor of *WLB* in November 1978 (at least two years before the manuscript of *Joy* would have been complete), why is he not noted and traced? (And, were the answer not fairly obvious, I would ask whether HCL has *WLB* holdings during the Eschelman period—only "fairly obvious," because we know how dangerous it is to make such judgments without having checked out the facts.)

5.2 *Item (1).* As I said, I do not disagree with the policy of self-naming. What I do disagree with is the moralistic manner in which Berman would

enforce it—i.e., by accusing any who do not fall at once into step with being bigots, when the matter may be still truly disputable (cf. below the lack of response to the Eskimo question).

5.2 *("Eskimos") (middle of item 4 paragraph). Eskimo* is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* supplement p. 342b as, "corrupt ad. an Amer. Indian word (cf. Abnaki *Eskimantsic*, Ojibway *Ashkimeq*) meaning 'eaters of raw flesh' (cf. Cree *aski* raw, *mow* he eats)." Again we have to deal not with a name as such but (as with *Bushmen*) with a (nonpejorative) description. In any case, the word "Inuit" seems a surprising choice for Berman, since according to C. Winick's *Dictionary of Anthropology* (Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adama, 1970) it literally means "men"(p. 289b). And in any case Inuit is made to carry too much load by positing it as equivalent to Eskimo:

> A major linguistic division occurs at Norton Sound in western Alaska, with the Siberian Eskimo and the Alaskan Eskimo living south of this area speaking a language (Yupik, Alaskan Eskimo) which is quite different from that of the Eskimo living to the north and east, who speak a language called Inupik, Inuit, or Central-Greenlandic. Linguistic defferences occurring in the vast geographical spread of the latter language are comparatively insignificant. In addition to the above, there are two Aleut languages: Eastern Aleut (Unalaskan) and Western Aleut (Atkan, Attuan). [George Peter Murdock and Timothy O'Leary: *Ethnographic Bibliography of North America*, 4th ed. New Haven: Human Relations Area File Press, 1975, I, 3a]

5.3 *Item 5.* As I said, both in these answers and to begin with, I find nothing to say against the policy of self naming except that there are more important problems to be solved.

5.5 *"Lapps."* Why *Saame* but not *Suomi*?

5.5 *"Anarchism."* Berman misses my point, namely that a type of a more general phenomenon, or a means to an end, deserves a *see also*-reference from the general phenomenon whether or not someone interested in that general phenomenon would repudiate such a type or such a means. (Berman seems to agree with such a principle in his response to the discussion of the Unification Church.)

5.5 *"Morphology."* Berman does quibble with Chan's concern for morphology, as if it were unimportant. She does concern herself with such problems as vocabulary, too, and would probably call the case that Berman mentions a vocabulary problem. But my text does not mention such a case (and *a fortiori* does not give a morphological case in arguing against Berman), what is Berman's warrant for mentioning such a case as if it

constituted a refutation of my point (that "he faults her for her primary concern for 'morphology'.")?

6-6.5 *(Cezanne)(1).* Each of the altermative collocations based on each isolate in any population of actual subject headings is for the sake of *some* browser; therefore, citation-order rules must be invoked to guarantee predictability. But to argue that one such citation order appeals, "regardless of personal opinion" (i.e., without *any* presuppositions), to "precisely those browsers most likely to want [it]" is obviously true: if I want spirit writings, I prefer them together. But this is not the point that should guide the construction of a system, because someone else may want some other isolate kept together. What *should* guide the construction of a system for retrieval is that citation order that will be most useful to the *majority* of users—and I think that in this case there is room for debate. My own point is to show that Berman's preferences are *not* without presuppositions (personal, all-too-personal), and that usefulness in the sense of provision of good collocation for *all* users' personal presuppositions cannot be the supreme value, because necessarily contradictory. (What *is* the supreme value? *System for the sake of predictability.*)

6-6.5 *Item 2.* When talking about subject cataloguing the argument should range over all the means for retrieving anything *about* the sought topic (as Berman himself shows analogously, in arguing for juvenile materials being interfiled with adult, etc.)

6-6.5 *Item 2. 780.207.* The Dewey classification's severalty of editions sometimes brings it about that an identical code can mean two at least partially different things, if derived from two editions. So one should consult *all* the editions from which a particular code could have been derived before making a translation of it into natural language. But I shall ignore that sage caveat and translate **780.207** as *Musical miscellany* **(780.2)**, *study and teaching* **(-07)**, basing this translation on the 18th edition. Berman wants the **-07** to translate as *humor*, but the use of **7** for humor is confined to "Subdivisions of Individual Literatures", i.e. **810-890**.

7 *To end of paragraph. "Underdeveloped."* What *are* the "first" and "second" worlds? Capitalist and Communist respectively? does the "third" world include OPEC? Perhaps; yes if it includes everything not specifically "western" or specifically "communist"; but note that we have had to shift from capitalist to "western", for many of the OPEC countries are indeed capitalist in some sense of the word. But does the "third" world then indeed equal the underdeveloped? Is Kuwait underdeveloped? (Cf. *Harper Dictionary of Modern Thought*, p.635a.)

7 *Item 3.* If this *nonsequitur* be true, then it must also be true to say that "going along...." is tantamount to going along with everything good in Western (nominally-) "Christian" civilization—or does Berman argue that Schweitzer, football, and microbiology are all bad because they arose or flourished within it?

7.1 *Item 4. ("Gay").* "Gay" means "full of or disposed to joy and mirth" (*Oxford English Dictionary* 4, p. 86c) in 1310, in 1386 (Chaucer), etc.; "Addicted to social pleasures and dissipations"(p. 86c) in 1637; "Bright or lively-looking, esp. in colour; brilliant, showy"(p. 87a) in the 1300s, etc. What *does* Berman think should spring to mind in any nonsimple-minded person as an alternative root-sense?

7.3 *Item 6, line 3. "Nowhere...."* Nor did I say so; but the direction is apparent: agree with these salutary changes or be branded *herrenvolkish*. I do not accept Berman's use of such a defamatory term to be self-justifying: my argument is that ethnic differences (whether biological or, as here, linguistic) are at the very base of such reprehensible behavior; I do not argue for the inherent superiority of Greek over non-Greek; but I do argue that using such terms as they were used—i.e., using them in library retrieval to represent the connotation they carry—is accurate. If I argue that the matter is not settled, as is shown by the usage of competent and nonprejudiced writers, the response would probably be that any writer's use of, for example, "man" proves that he/she is not in fact nonprejudiced; thus: Submit or perish, i.e., linguistic/conceptual totalitarianism.

7.5 *"How often...."* Berman's answering the third question without answering the first and second allows him to escape the force of their emphases—"whose being offended" and "whose first try"; only when we see the tension between these two does the third question *live* as it actually applies in our work: that is, are we concerned with service, or with doing what makes us see ourselves in a good light?

8-8.1 *Item 2.* This might be true if the text had read "even when the book *as a whole* is not about retirement"; but as it stands it's as much as to say that a book on **Conflict of generations**, etc. as in my original critique. Nor is LC contradicting itself: headings arise to be applied to whole books, and may then be used "analytically"—foolish and less than helpful, but not contradictory. But to use an established heading on an "analytic" one is no logical argument for inventing new ones, unless Berman really thinks that "not about [x] per se" *means* "not about [x] as a whole".

8.2 *Item 3 (end of paragraph).* Probably so, as I said already.

9 *"Subdivision...."* Then that (a revolutionary move, to say the least) should have been mentioned. Otherwise, how would we know that **National songs—U.S.** is not just as acceptable as **National songs, American**?—an occurrence of a sort that every experienced reference librarian knows will occasionally occur, whatever the goodwill of the cataloguing staff. But it is some help in preventing such mistakes that a heading in the authority file not allowed to be place-divided is somehow so indicated, even if only by the absence of the permission to subdivide.

9.1 *"HCL's entry...."* OK; but if afterthoughts can clear Berman and his library of criticisms, how far can they go to clear me of any factual errors into which I have doubtless fallen?

9.3 *"Establishing...."* Always distrust any argument which calls a suggestion "plainly ridiculous." The point is that dual entry is far more (nor merely potentially but in concrete and palpable fact) "interminable," or at least space-wasting and indeed inaccurate.

9.3 *(Second citation) "Judah...."* Berman calls for a *Jewish* access-point; my point is that the "golem" is a legend associated (falsely, to boot) with a Jew, and is merely one of the whole host of homunculus-legends; better, then, a subject heading *Golem* with *see also*-references to it from *Legends, Jewish* (as is already in LCSH, and as does already provide a Jewish access-point) and from **Homunculus** (at end of paragraph). Amen!

9.4 *"Feminism...."* Perhaps so, but so what? If Berman isists on using both he should also want to use both **Catholic Church** and **Catholicism**, etc. A concept can be discussed without discussing the organization that furthers it, but the organization can scarcely be discussed without discussing the concept; thus arises the tendency to get along with only one heading of each such pair. And then we come to the issue of currency, and find ourselves (almost always) inextricably mired in the slippery changeableness of the *au courant*—which, I maintain, is a long way from our central problem.

9.5 *"Unification...."* Berman, as so often, misses my point: here, that since hierarchy defines (even if a user happens to disagree), LCSH is not a natural but an artificial language, using the disputed term in the sense of that hierarchical definition; and that whoever does not *see* this (as a reference librarian) cannot but mislead the users who consult him/her.

10.2 *"He suggests...." [middle of his paragraph].* Most of these works are not fiction! As to the "extraordinary difficulty" involved, see Annelise

Mark Pejtersen, "A New Approach to the Classification of Fiction" and J. Austin, "The AMP Classification System for Fiction: Trial Applications and Retrieveal Tests", in International Study Conference on Classification Research, *Universal Classification I, Subject Analysis and Ordering Systems* (Frankfurt: Indeks Verlag, 1982), 207-226.

(end of his paragraph)

No—the fact is that only those who don't see the point behind an objection can dismiss it so cavalierly—as in Weiler's Law: "Nothing is impossible for the man who doesn't have to do it himself." (Harold Faber. *The Book of Laws*. New York: Times, 1979, p. 113.)

10.3 *("Labeling.")* If Berman wants a generic-process term like "labeling" to carry all that conceptual load, OK—but isn't that a lot like using "man" both for a general concept (=humanity) and a special concept (=male humans)?

10.4 *"DECENTRALIZATION."* This response of Berman's I accept, namely that I don't know the conceptual contents of the Seldman book well enough from just its title; but it is hard to see the same principle being even possibly exemplified in the Goldberg book, which can*not* be about non-Jewish misconceptions unless the author is wholly irresponsible in choosing his title. But this second example Berman does not, note, attempt to defend.

10.5 *"ENDOWMENTS."* It is hard to restrain one's temper when one points out the unresolved ambiguity of **Foundations** and is accused of a failure of perspicacity. The question is not whether ambiguity requires resolution: Berman admits that; but rather of which concept (the substructure of buildings/organizations to distribute funds/ladies' undergarments) is to be used as an unqualified heading—if *any*. Strictly, none should be; but if one is to be, it should be that concept which is used in the least metaphorical sense, i.e., (I would argue) "the substructure of buildings." I doubt very much that it is true that there are significantly greater numbers of libraries with books on "organizations to distribute funds" than on "substructures of buildings."

10.6 *"The Lady."* It is true that (had it been locally available) I would have consulted the work referred to by the heading in question; but that I did not does not make my criticism fatuous, given the difficulty of verifying such a citation. Once again, though, it is useful to point out that the author of a work that is going to be read outside the area of coverage of certain (local) rules or beyond the area where facts can be expeditiously checked has a duty to his readers in such cases as this, namely to explicitly mention why certain likely misconstructions should not be made.

("Zoophilia")(end of his paragraph)
Good; why does not the author acknowledge that his critic is on the right track here, as the critic so often does of the author?

11.2 *"Blood."* Berman's error is to think that the citation-order rule that would place a book at **A : B : C** means that **A** is thereby taken to be more important as justification of its prepotence, and that **C** is less important for the converse reason; and therefore that in the case **C** is patently more important, that we should cross-classify it as **C : B : A** . Granted that such disasters *do* occur in the cataloguing process at LC, who would argue that they are to be encouraged?

11.4-11.5 *"The New Celibacy."* But this is certainly not a *good* place for it in terms of browsing, if the arrangement of the "tree" was sensible before the first shift and then the second—which is all we are debating as long as Dewey is our focus.

11.7 *DDC*. Berman does not, in this response, recognize the point of my comments: only theory grounded in and dedicated to the resolution of problems of *practice* is good theory. Thus a theorist (and only a practice-oriented one can be, for me, a good one) is someone whose exile to the status of mere "consultant" is someone whose contribution is thereby consigned to the category "of minimal effect": a pity, a waste?

12-12.2 To use Berman's own technique of refutation, the fact that a reviewer can pick *this* piece out for kudos by that very fact excludes him (?) her from serious consideration as a judge of Berman's accomplishment.

12-12.2 *"No matter what...."* With this, as I have written before, I agree!

5.2 *"Eskimos."* Sam Goldstein and Sherrill Cheda in 1974 discussed Inuit nomenclature—including "Yuit" and "men/people"—with considerable grace, wit, and expertise. For their exchange, plus editorial comments on cataloguing implications, see *HCLCB*, no. 8/9/10, 1 Sept. 1974, pp. 3-7. Once more: If it can be demonstrated that "Finns" is an inaccurate and unwanted translation of "Suomi," then SUOMI should become the primary form. Where's the documentation?

5.5 *"Anarchism/Terrorism."* There's a huge difference berween a "general phenomenon" and "means to an end." Terrorism may be a "means" to various ends—e.g., Anarchism, Christianity, Nazism, Liberalism, Capitalism, Marxism, Judaism, Islam, Fascism, etc. Except for Nazism and Fascism, it is not necessarily intrinsic to those movements, philosophies, or religions, nor—without further particularization—is it a clear-cut "type" of any of them. By contrast, the "Unification Church" does qualify as a subcategory, variety, or "type" of Christianity and so merits appropriate Christian-related classification and cross-references.

6-6.5 *Item 2.* It isn't that "Berman wants the -07" in 780.207 "to translate as humor," it's that Dewey wants it to translate that way, for DDC does not confine "the use of 7 for humor...to 'Subdivisions of Individual Literatures.'" See Table 1. "Standard Subdivisions," DDC 18, vol. 1, p. 116: "-0207 Humorous treatment." And for the identical subdivision in Edition 19: vol. 1, p. 3.

7.1 and 7.3 Luckily, neither homophobia nor mysogyny is an irreversible disorder. Each can be treated. And even cured. But the afflicted must first admit they "have it."

7-7.5 *"Third World/Underdeveloped Areas."* For a careful overview and analysis of "Third World" as a concept and descriptor, see Grant McCall. "Four Worlds of Experience and Action." *Third World Quarterly* 2(July 1980):536-45. McCall describes various "models"—Ideological, Technical-Economic, and Power—indicating that "First World" may encompass the "capitalist, developed world" or the two "superpowers," and "Second World" either the "planned, socialist economies...including the Soviet Union, China, and the like" or "the developed satellites of the superpowers, with Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia in the same category as France and Sweden." According to the ideological model, "poverty, apparent low productive capacity, and, crucially, former colonial status" characterize Third World nations, while the Technical-Economic Model defines Third World countries on the basis of "Whether they were industrialised or not industrialised and, with the exception of OPEC's temporary wealth, this

10.6 *ad "The Lady."* Since whenever it seems likely the reader might reasonably think a heading appropriate that heading in fact is not appropriate. This attitude of Mr. Berman's shows well the private, in-house, nature of the original publication, namely that such precautions for the sake of a noncaptive, non-"in"-on-what-we're-doing-here audience are not taken. What is not necessary in a catalogue as such *is* often necessary in something seeking to explain that catalogue.

SANFORD BERMAN: RESPONSE III

A few multiple-choices:

2 Journal articles are reprinted in book-form because they:

(a) originally appeared in ephemeral sources
(b) may reach a new, nonjournal-reading audience
(c) may be better preserved and accessed (e.g., through catalogues and reviews)
(d) all of the above

5.5 "Terrorism" is best exemplified by:

(a) Prince Kropotkin's doctrines in *Mutual Aid*
(b) Anarchist collectives like the Haymarket Press in Minneapolis
(c) the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki
(d) massive defoliation during the Vietnam War
(e) the beating, imprisonment, and murder of 1960s' civil rights workers
(f) c through e

7-7.5 According to the "technical-economic model" described by Grant McCall, which classifies countries as "Third World" if they are "not industrialised," OPEC members, none of which is significantly industrialized, should:

(a) be classed as Third World
(b) not be classed as Third World

10.5 In *Joy*, this note appears at the bottom of page 36: "Reprinted with permission from *Sex Magazines in the Library Collection: A Scholarly Study of Sex in Serials and Periodicals* (a monographic supplement to *The Serials Librarian*), edited by Peter Gellatly, © 1980 by The Haworth Press, Inc." Haworth Press monographs are:

(a) private, in-house publications
(b) widely-reviewed and marketed titles intended for an international audience

And two statistical tables:

Total selections	*Reprinted from HCLCB*	*Reprinted from other sources*	*Never published before*
44	22	16	6

J.M. PERREAULT: RESPONSE III

ad 2 — no response —

ad 5.5 — no response —

ad 7-7.5 "None"? I seem to remember that as a certain style of argument against letting(?) the Iranians take over control and operation of their own oil-production equipment—right?

ad 10.5 ["In Joy"] I missed the mark here. Better were it to have focused on the clear (though not clearly expressed) "how to" orientation of the original paper, which should have led its author to what would make such an orientation truly professional, namely to a behind-the-scenes description, not merely of the results of such a (worthwhile, let me insist!) project, but also of pitfalls to be avoided, tools useful in constructing the indexing language, the control structure behind that language, the syndetic quasi-hierarchicalization manifested in its references....That's what I meant by "in-house."

ad 10.6 ["I would expect"] What it reperesents is my recollection, after 20 years away from MPL—and it also represents my attempt to restrain myself from making points dogmatically, even though to do so is more likely to silence response. But while I deplore and do not seek automatic *reaction*, I do *seek* response.

SANFORD BERMAN: RESPONSE II

1.1 *Ephemerata.* Ephemerata—things written not for the profession as a whole...and referring to sources of information not available to the reader in Alabama or Oregon." The bimonthly *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, from which most of the *Joy* material derived, has been continuously published since 1973, its circulation (outside Hennepin County) often exceeding 500. Further, it has been extensively cited and reviewed in national media, and through mid-1979 engendered among HCL and other readers what can truly be termed the liveliest and most critical dialogue on cataloguing issues published anywhere during that period. Similarly, HCL's quarterly *Authority File*—a cumulative microfiche service containing all name, topical, and series' forms employed at HCL—has been widely sold since 1977. Indeed, the Library of Congress Subject Cataloguing Division considers it a major new-term source (see *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, Spring 1982, p. 54). Currently, eight libraries in states near Alabama subscribe to the *Bulletin*. So do two in Oregon. An entry for MINORITY LITERATURE, indicating the LC form it replaced and specifying both "see" and "see also" references, appeared in *HCLCB* No. 40 May/June 1979, p. 40. That report could be identified by consulting the *Alphabetical Index to HCL Cataloging Bulletins No. 31-40* (1979), p. 24.

2.5 *Y.A.A.N. and YAAN.* Y.A.A.N. = an initialism; YAAN = an acronym (i.e., a pronounceable word).

4 *"Carping...."* To wearily reiterate. Those "native English-speakers" *did* fail to comprehend the "b" in name/dates within the context of an actual catalogue entry.

4.4 *Torah.* The common understanding is exactly what *Everyman's Judaica: An Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1975) states on p. 598, "Pentateuch or pentateuchal scroll for reading in synagogue."

4.5 *"General...."* (end of section). Unfortunately, an omnibus reference in most dictionary catalogues would be too easily overlooked by someone searching specifically for "General *Eisenhower*," which is likely to be filed at some distance from the suggested note.

4.6 *"Elaborate note."* A careful "scholar" would have noticed that the piece featuring the *WLB* entry was reprinted from the 1 June 1975 *HCLCB*—i.e., it represented the cataloguing for that periodical as of mid-1975, nearly three years before Milo Nelson became editor.

categorization would roughly correspond to GNP per capita figures." Finally, from the Power Model perspective, "the Third World...is made up of the primary producing, largely unindustrialised former colonial possessions of the First and Second Worlds." Such countries "rely heavily upon the export of raw materials for their wealth and are usually heavy importers of manufactured goods. OPEC countries, for all their temporary wealth, are firmly Third World in this power definition."

9.4 The elemental, easily-determined fact is that CATHOLIC CHURCH (which denotes the organization) is amply complemented in LCSH by rubrics representing Catholic concepts, practices, etc.: e.g., CATHOLIC LEARNING AND SCHOLARSHIP; CATHOLIC LITERATURE; and THEOLOGY, CATHOLIC.

10.5 *ENDOWMENTS v. FOUNDATIONS.* Anyone who can honestly "doubt very much that...there is a significantly greater number of libraries with books on 'organizations to distribute funds' than on 'substructures of buildings'" lives in another country, if not another world.

10.6 *"The lady."* Since when must an indexer explain why a particular work has not been indexed under a term that doesn't apply to it?

11.7 *DDC.* "Minimal effect," yes. "A pity, a waste?" Uh-uh.

J.M. PERREAULT: RESPONSE II

1.1 *ad "Ephemerata."* To quote Mr. Berman himself, the principle vehicle of these pieces as originally published, *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*, "has been extensively cited and reviewed in *national* media" [my emphasis]. The term ephemerata makes no value judgment. If Mr. Berman regards these pieces as nuggets worthy of nonephemeral availability, let him publish them in a nonephemeral way, either in a national medium or in a book—and behold, it has been done! But why if they were not originally ephemerally published?

4.4 *ad Torah.* "The common understanding"is not all that "see-references" are designed to enshrine.

4.5 *ad "General..." (end of section).* Does this response of Mr. Berman suggest that *every* author or subject known as "General X" or "President Y", or the like, is to get a reference analogous to that for Amin? If so, I need make no argument at all; Mr. Berman has done it for me already.

4.6 *ad "Elaborate note."* And a careful scholarly author would have revised the piece being republished to conform to the later state of affairs.

5.5 *ad "Anarchism...."* At last Mr. Berman gets down to concept analysis, and lets us see that all he wants to do is to define Anarchism more favorably than I (and than most, I venture to guess, of the consultors of the catalogue) do.

6-6.5 item 2 *ad "-07...."* Agreed.

7.1 and **7.3** *ad "homophobia...."* Mr. Berman's argument is as clear cut a case of linguistic totalitarianism as can easily be imagined: "I'll argue with you, once you admit that you're wrong—OK? and now that you've admitted that, stop your groundless arguing!"

7-7.5 *ad Third World.* Not everyone, I think, would agree with Grant McCall's "Power definition"—and even for him it is only one of three definitions given, the others ("ideological model" and "technical-economic model") clearly not including OPEC in the Third World.

10.5 *ad ENDOWMENTS.* At UAH, an academic library, there are indeed more books of foundations as "organizations to distribute funds"; but at Milwaukee Public Library (long ago a former employer of mine for several years) I would expect as many or more on "substructures of buildings" for the construction engineer, for the home-improver,...

Total pages	*Reprinted from HCLCB*	*Reprinted from other sources*	*Never published before*	*Index, etc.*
249	66	85	51	47

While more selections derived from the *HCL Cataloging Bulletin* than from any other source, it was not the origin of "most" selections. Further, material from non-*Bulletin* sources accounted for nearly twice as many pages as items republished from *HCLCB*. It thus appears that my learned adversary not only can't build Dewey numbers but also has some trouble counting. My regret is that I "fell" for his unverified assertion, foolishly parroting it—without checking—in my second "response." Well, nobody's perfect...

10.6 "I would expect" represents:

(a) certain, verified knowledge
(b) unsubstantiated guessing

EDITOR'S COMMENT

A recent library literature reviewer of one of our *Occasional Papers* proposed that its predecessors had all been characterized by "tedious presentation of factual material." Such glibness can perhaps be regretfully attributed to a lack of familiarity with the workings of objective scholarship: he truly knows not whereof he speaks. The excitement of interesting topics and vital issues may either be quietly assumed in the best interests of allowing the ideas to speak for themselves; or prominently displayed so as to convey the fervor of an author's involvement. It is a timely coincidence, then, that permits our series to answer the critic with the overwhelming display of glittering rhetoric, meticulous logic, stunning devastations,and passionate equanimity of Messrs. Perreault and Berman. To propose that they have induced more heat than light is perhaps to confirm that perception does indeed lie in the mind of the beholder Underneath the basic points introduced by our two authors lie some of the major problems that face the cataloguing community of today: genuine and honest differences in perspective, technical problems that result from the characteristics of the several communications media called on to convey bibliographical data, and perhaps quite a bit of miscellaneous static that we may never be able to purge completely. Your gentle editor must confess to having opened the latest responses from the protagonists with a fire extinguisher close at hand; but he also sees it as a special honor to be able to present their differing viewpoints.

—D.W.K.

VITAE

J.M. PERREAULT

J.M. Perreault is currently subject specialist at the University of Alabama Library in Huntsville. He received his B.S. in English and philosophy from Rockhurst (1952); an A.M. in English and philosophy from Marquette (1957); and an M.L.S. from the University of Wisconsin at Madison (1959).

Mr. Perreault has done selecting, cataloging, and reference work at a public library in Milwaukee (1959/63). He has worked at an academic library at Florida Atlantic University where he designed a computerized cataloging system. He investigated computerized retrieval based on LC/LCSH. He discovered these were of little use for retrieval and became interested in more usable systems such as UDC and CC.

Mr. Perreault has taught cataloging and classification at the University of Maryland Library School (1965/68). He was director of the University of Alabama Library at Huntsville (1968/75). While there he established a subject specialist organization and has been a subject specialist since 1975.

Some of Mr. Perreault's publications include "Categories and Relators" (rev. int. de doc., 1965); *Introduction to UDC* (1969); *Towards a Theory for UDC* (1969); *The Idea of Order in Bibliography* (delivered in 1975 as the Sarada Ranganathan Foundation Lectures); *Latest vs. Contemporaneous Place Names in LC Subject Headings* (cat. classification, quarterly, 1982); "Authority Control Old and New" (*Libri*, 1982). He was also the editor for both *Proceedings* (meeting of the International Symposium on Relational Factors in Classification) (1967); and of volume 2 of *Universal Classification*, Proceedings of the 4th International Study Conference on Classification Research (Augsburg, 1982).

Mr. Perreault is also involved in musical composition and has had several of his works performed. These include: "A Double Contata," "A Woodwind Quintet," "A Fantasia for Flute and Chamber Orchestra," and an overture commission for the opening of a civic center.

SANFORD BERMAN

Sanford Berman is currently head cataloger at the Hennepin County (Minnesota) Library. He received his M.L.S. from Catholic University of America in 1961.

Before going to Minnesota, Mr. Berman worked as a public, military, academic, and special librarian in Washington, D.C., West Germany, California, Zambia, and Uganda. He has been the editor of *SRRT Newsletter* and the *HCL Cataloging Bulletin*. Mr. Berman has authored *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (Scarecrow Press, 1971). In 1972 he compiled *Subject Headings Employed at the Makerere Institute of Social Research Library: A Select List* (Makerere University Library).

In addition to his bimonthly "Consumer Beware!" column for *Technicalities*, he edits the quarterly column, "Alternatives," for *Collection Building*; prepares cumulative subject indexes for *Information America* and an annual index for *Technicalities*. Mr. Berman also serves on the editorial boards for *New Pages*; the *Minnesota Literature Newsletter*; *Alternatives Press Annual*; and *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin*. Recently he has compiled *Subject Cataloging: The Pain and the Promise* (to be published by Haworth Press) and with Jim Danky will coedit Oryx Press' *Alternative Library Literature: A Biennial Anthology*.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS deal with any aspect of librarianship and consist of papers which are too long or too detailed for publication in a library periodical or which are of specialized or temporary interest. Manuscripts for inclusion in this series are invited and should be sent to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

Papers in this series are issued irregularly, and no more often than monthly. Subscriptions for 1984 may be established for $13.00 per year. At least five papers will be issued annually, beginning with number 163 for 1984. Individual copies of current or back numbers may be ordered (prepaid) for $3.00 each. Send orders to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Make checks payable to University of Illinois.

D.W. Krummel, Editor
James S. Dowling, Associate Editor

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Hugh C. Atkinson
Charles H. Davis
J.L. Divilbiss
Kathleen M. Heim
Lawrence W.S. Auld
Terry L. Weech
Linda C. Smith